arXiv:1702.04163v1 [math.LO] 14 Feb 2017

The Euclidean numbers

Vieri Benci
Dipartimento di Matematica
Università di Pisa, Italy.
benci@dma.unipi.it

Marco Forti
Dipartimento di Matematica
Università di Pisa, Italy.
forti@dma.unipi.it

Abstract

We introduce axiomatically a Nonarchimedean field $\mathbb{E}$, called the field of the Euclidean numbers, where a transfinite sum is defined that is indicized by ordinal numbers less than the first inaccessible Ω. Thanks to this sum, $\mathbb{E}$ becomes a saturated hyperreal field isomorphic to the so called Kiesler field of cardinality Ω, and there is a natural isomorphic embedding into $\mathbb{E}$ of the semiring Ω equipped by the natural sum and product. Moreover suitable topologies can be put on $\mathbb{E}$ and on $\Omega \cup \{\Omega\}$ so as to obtain the transfinite sums as limits of a suitable class of their finite subsums.

Finally a notion of numerosity satisfying all Euclidean common notions is given, whose values are nonnegative nonstandard integers of $\mathbb{E}$. Then $\mathbb{E}$ can be charachterized as the hyperreal field generated by the real numbers together with the semiring of numerosities (and this explains the name "Euclidean" numbers).

Keywords: Nonstandard Analysis, Nonarchimedean fields, Euclidean numerosities

MSC[2010]: 26E35, 03H05, 03C20, 03E65, 12L99

Contents

1 Notation and preliminary notions **4**
1.1 Operations on Ω 4
1.2 Indecomposable ordinals 6
1.3 The formal inclusion 7

2 The field of the Euclidean numbers **8**
2.1 Axiomatic introduction of the Euclidean numbers as infinite sums 8
2.2 Ordinal numbers as Euclidean numbers 11
2.3 The counting functions 12
2.4 The topology of the Euclidean numbers 16

3 Euclidean numbers and Nonstandard Analysis **18**
3.1 Hyperreal fields 18
3.2 The Euclidean numbers as hyperreal numbers 19
3.3 Saturation 21
3.4 The Keisler hyperreal field 22
3.5 Ω versus $\mathbb{N}^*$ 23
3.6 Hyperfinite sums v/s transfinite sums 24

4 Numerosities **27**
4.1 Saving the five Euclidean common notions 28
4.2 The Euclidean numerosity theories 30
4.3 Euclidean numerosity v/s Aristotelian size 33

5 The existence of the field of the Euclidean numbers **35**
5.1 The complete ordinals 35
5.2 The Euclidean ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ 38
5.3 A construction of the field of the Euclidean numbers 40

Introduction

In this paper we introduce a numeric field denoted by $\mathbb{E}$, which we name the *field of the Euclidean numbers*. The theory of the Euclidean numbers combines the Cantorian theory of ordinal numbers with Non Standard Analysis (NSA).

From the algebraic point of view, the Eucliean numbers are a non-Archimedean field with a supplementary structure (the *Euclidean structure*), which characterizes it. This Euclidean structure is introduced axiomatically by the operation of *transfinite sum*: more precisely, in Section 2 we introduce sums of the type $\sum_{k<\alpha} a_k$ where the $a_k s$ are real numbers, while k and α are ordinal

numbers in Ω, the set of the ordinals smaller than the first inaccessible ordinal. We give in Subsection 2.1 three natural axioms that rule the behaviour of these transfinite sums.

We list the main peculiarities of the Euclidean numbers that we deduce from the axioms on transfinite sums:

- The field $\mathbb{E}$ is saturated with respect to the order relation, actually it is the *unique saturated real closed field having the cardinality of* Ω (see Subsection 3.3). This property implies that every ordered field having cardinality less than or equal to Ω is (isomorphic to) a subfield of $\mathbb{E}$.

- Every Euclidean number can be obtained as an infinite sum of real numbers (see Subsection 2.1); more generally, a transfinite sum of Euclidean numbers is well defined (see Subsection 2.1), and can be obtained as *limit of ordinal-indexed partial sums*, when suitable topologies are given to $\mathbb{E}$ and to the ordinals (see Subsection 2.4).

- Any accessible ordinal $\alpha \in \Omega$ can be identified with the transfinite sum of α ones in $\mathbb{E}$; this identification is consistent with the *natural ordinal operations* $+$ and $\cdot$ (see Subsection 2.2), so the field of the Euclidean numbers can be considered as a sort of *natural* extension of the *semiring* of the (accessible) ordinal numbers.

- The Euclidean numbers are a *hyperreal field*; more precisely $\mathbb{E}$ is isomorphic to the hyperreal Keisler field introduced in [20]; the Keisler field is the unique saturated (in the sense of NSA) hyperreal field having the cardinality of Ω (see Subsection 3.4).

- the Euclidean numbers are strictly related to the notion of *numerosity*, introduced in [2, 4, 6] and devloped in [7, 16, 13, 19], so as to save the five Euclidean common notions (see Section 4). In fact, $\mathbb{E}$ can be charachterized as the hyperreal field generated by the real numbers and the semiring of numerosities, provided that the numerosity is defined on *a coherent family of labelled set containing the accessible ordinal numbers*. The numerosity theory provided by the Euclidean numbers satisfies the following properties which alltogether are not shared by other numerosity theories (see Subsections 4.1-4.2):

  - each set (in this theory) is equinumerous to a set of ordinals,

– the set of numerosities $\mathfrak{N}$ is a positive subsemiring of nonstandard integers, that generates the whole $\mathbb{Z}^*$.

We have chosen to call $\mathbb{E}$ the field of the *Euclidean* numbers for two main reasons: firstly, this field arises in a numerosity theory (including the subsets of Ω), whose main aim is to save all the Euclidean common notions, including the fifth

The whole is greater than the part,

in contrast to the Cantorian theory of cardinal numbers.

The second reason is that, in our opinion, the field $\mathbb{E}$ describes the Euclidean continuum better than the *real field* $\mathbb{R}$, at least when looking for a *set theoretic* interpretation of the *Euclidean geometry*. This last point has been dealt with in [9] and will be shortly outlined in the Appendix.

1 Notation and preliminary notions

Let Ω be the least (strongly) *inaccessible* cardinal. Or better, taking into account that in what follows the ordinals are viewed *"à la Cantor"* as *atomic* numbers, which are not *identified with*, but rather considered as the *order types of* the set of all the smaller ordinals, let Ω be the *set of all accessible ordinals*.

1.1 Operations on Ω

Since we use the ordinary symbols $\cdot$ and $+$ for the operations on the Euclidean numbers that we shall define in section 4.2, and among them we shall include the ordinals, the *usual ordinal mutiplication and addition* on Ω will be denoted by $\odot$ and $\oplus$, respectively, whereas $\cdot$ and $+$ will correspond to the so called *natural operations*, see below.

Given ordinals $x, j \in \Omega$, there exist uniquely determined ordinals $k \in \Omega$ ed $s < \omega^j$, such that

$$x = \left(\omega^j \odot k\right) \oplus s;$$

therefore, throughout the paper, we shall adopt the following notation:

$$s = \langle x \rangle_j \,;\; k = \langle x \rangle^j \,,$$

so as to have

$$x = \left(\omega^j \odot \langle x \rangle^j\right) \oplus \langle x \rangle_j \,.$$

Recall that each ordinal has a unique *normal form*

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \odot a_n$$

where $a_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n_1 < n_2 \Rightarrow j_{n_1} > j_{n_2}$.

As we identify the ordinals in Ω with numbers of the field $\mathbb{E}$, we shall simply write the normal form $x = \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \omega^{j_n}$, following the usual notation of linear combinations, independently of the ordering of the exponents. But one has to be careful: sum and product agree with the *ordinary ordinal operations* only when *the exponents are decreasing and the integer coefficients are put on the right side.*

By using the normal form, the *natural ordinal operations* can be defined as follows: given

$$\alpha = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \odot a_n \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \odot b_n$$

let

$$\alpha + \beta = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \odot (a_n + b_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \cdot \beta = \sum_{n=1}^{H} \omega^{h_n} \odot \left(\sum_{h_n = j_l + j_m} a_l b_m \right),$$

where $a_n + b_n$ and $a_l b_m$ are the usual operations on natural numbers.

The normal form can be alternatively considered without coefficients, namely

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n}, \text{ where } n_1 < n_2 \Rightarrow j_{n_1} \geq j_{n_2}.$$

When using this "coefficient free" normal form, the natural ordinal operations are given as follows:

$$\text{for } \alpha = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \text{ and } \beta = \sum_{n=1}^{M} \omega^{h_n} \text{ let } \alpha + \beta = \sum_{n=1}^{N+M} \omega^{k_n} \text{ and } \alpha \cdot \beta = \sum_{n=1}^{NM} \omega^{l_n},$$

where k_n and l_n are *non-increasing enumerations* of the union of the sequences j_n, h_n and respectively of the double sequence $j_n + h_m$.

1.2 Indecomposable ordinals

An ordinal $\gamma > 0$ is *additively indecomposable* (also called *gamma number*) if

$$\alpha, \beta < \gamma \Longrightarrow \alpha \oplus \beta < \gamma.$$

So, for any $\alpha, \beta < \gamma$, we have also $\alpha + \beta < \gamma$ and $\alpha \oplus \gamma = \gamma$. The additively indecomposable ordinals are those of the form ω^j, for all j; in particular every infinite cardinal is additively indecomposable.[1]

Similarly, an ordinal δ is *multiplicatively indecomposable* (also called *delta number*) if

$$\alpha, \beta < \delta \Longrightarrow \alpha \odot \beta < \delta.$$

Again, for any $\alpha, \beta < \delta$, we have also $\alpha\beta < \delta$ and $\alpha \odot \delta = \delta$. The multiplicatively indecomposable ordinals are those of the form $\delta_j = \omega^{\omega^j}$, for any ordinal j. So any multiplicatively indecomposable ordinal is also additively indecomposable, and every infinite cardinal is multiplicatively indecomposable.

The ordinals δ_j can also be defined inductively by putting

$$\delta_0 = \omega, \text{ and } \delta_j = \sup\left\{ \delta_l^n \mid l < j,\, n \in \omega \right\}, \text{ so } \delta_{j+1} = \sup\left\{ \delta_j^n \mid n \in \omega \right\}.$$

The delta numbers are *arithmetically closed* in the sense that *sums, products* and *(finite) powers* of ordinals less than δ_j remain less than δ_j.
It is easily seen that every ordinal $\alpha < \delta_{j+1} \in \Omega$ can be uniquely represented as:

$$\alpha = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k \delta_j^k; \quad a_k < \delta_j,\, a_n \neq 0.$$

Iterating this representation until the coefficients are in $\mathbb{N}$, one obtains a representation of α as a *polynomial* with coefficients in $\mathbb{N}$ in a finite number of deltas $\delta_{j_1}, \ldots, \delta_{j_m} \leq \delta_j$:

$$\alpha = \sum_{e_i \leq M} a_{e_1 \ldots e_m} \delta_{j_1}^{e_1} \ldots \delta_{j_m}^{e_m}.$$

So each γ-number $\gamma_k = \omega^k$ is equal to a *monic monomial* $\delta_{j_1}^{k_1} \ldots \delta_{j_m}^{k_m}$.

[1] Following the common usage, we identify a cardinal with the *least* ordinal of this cardinality.

1.3 The formal inclusion

We introduce a partial ordering $\sqsubseteq$ (*formal inclusion*)[2] between ordinals by considering their normal forms:

$$\alpha = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \odot a_n \;\sqsubseteq\; \beta = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \odot b_n \iff a_n \leqq b_n \text{ for } 1 \leq n \leq N.$$

In particular $0 \sqsubseteq \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega$.

The formal inclusion has two important properties:

- $\{\xi \mid \xi \sqsubseteq \alpha\}$ is *finite* for all $\alpha \in \Omega$;[3]
- $\alpha \sqsubseteq \beta \implies \alpha \leq \beta$.

The relation $\sqsubseteq$ equippes Ω with a natural *lattice* structure where

$$a \vee b = \min\,\{x \,|\, x \sqsupseteq a,\, x \sqsupseteq b\} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \odot c_n \;\; \textit{with} \;\; c_n = \max\,(a_n, b_n),$$

$$a \wedge b = \max\,\{x \,|\, x \sqsubseteq a,\, x \sqsubseteq b\} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \omega^{j_n} \odot d_n \;\; \textit{with} \;\; d_n = \min\,(a_n, b_n).$$

According to this definition we have for all $x \in \Omega$

$$x = (\omega^j \odot \langle x \rangle^j) \vee \langle x \rangle_j \;\text{ and }\; (\omega^j \odot \langle x \rangle^j) \wedge \langle x \rangle_j = 0.$$

In particular one obtains for all $h, \beta \in \Omega$ the following useful criterion:

(C) $$k < \omega^j \implies (\,\omega^j \odot h + k \sqsubseteq \beta \iff \omega^j \odot h,\, k \sqsubseteq \beta\,)$$

Remark that the *divisor relation* between γ-numbers, considered as monomials in the δs, corresponds to the *formal inclusion between the exponents*, namely

$$\omega^h \mid \omega^k \iff h \sqsubseteq k\,,$$

equivalently, if $h = \sum_{n=1}^{N} h_n \omega^{j_n}$, $k = \sum_{n=1}^{N} k_n \omega^{j_n}$, then

$$\omega^h \mid \omega^k \iff \exists l\,(\omega^l \omega^h = \omega^{l+h} = \omega^k) \iff \exists l = \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n \omega^{j_n} \text{ s.t. } \forall n\,(l_n + h_n = k_n).$$

---

[2] The name formal inclusion should recall that the respective coefficient free normal forms, considered as *multisets*, are indeed contained one inside of the other one.

[3] Actually $|\{\xi \mid \xi \sqsubseteq \alpha\}| = \prod_n (a_n + 1)$.

2 The field of the Euclidean numbers

We introduce the field of the *Euclidean numbers* as constituded of all transfinite sums of real numbers, of length equal to some accessible ordinal in Ω. We ground on the properties of the *formal inclusion* $\sqsubseteq$ introduced in Subsection 1.3.

2.1 Axiomatic introduction of the Euclidean numbers as infinite sums

Let $\mathbb{E}$ be an *ordered superfield of the reals*, let

$$\mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E}) = \left\{\xi \in \mathbb{E}^{\Omega} \,|\, \exists j \in \Omega,\, \forall \beta > j,\, \xi_j = 0\right\}$$

be the set of all *eventually* 0 Ω-*sequences* of elements of $\mathbb{E}$, and let an $\mathbb{E}$-*linear* map $\Sigma : \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E}) \to \mathbb{E}$ be given.

Call $\mathbb{E}$ the *field of the Euclidean numbers*, and for $\xi = \langle \xi_k \mid k \in \Omega \rangle \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ denote

$$\sum_k \xi_k := \Sigma(\xi),$$

called the *transfinite sum of the Euclidean numbers* $\xi_k, k \in \Omega$.

By $\mathbb{E}$-linearity of Σ one has

$$\sigma \sum_h \xi_h + \tau \sum_h \eta_h = \sum_h (\sigma\xi_h + \tau\eta_h) \quad for\ all\ \sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{E}.$$

Moreover we assume that a *transfinite sum* coincides with the *ordinary sum* of the field $\mathbb{E}$ if the number of *non-zero summands* is *finite*.

We also assume that Σ satisfies the following axioms

RA ***Real numbers Axiom*:**
For all $\xi \in \mathbb{E}$ *there exists* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) = \mathscr{S}(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{R}^{\Omega}$ *such that* $\Sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \xi$

Grounding on the axiom RA, in the follwing axioms we restrict ourselves to considering transfinite sums of *real numbers*. For sake of clarity, we denote general Euclidean numbers by *greek* letters ξ, η, ζ, and real numbers by *latin* letters x, y, z.

CA ***Comparison Axiom*:**

For all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{R}^{\Omega}$*, if there is* $\beta \in \Omega$ *such that*

$$\sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_k \leq \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} y_k \quad for\ all \quad \alpha \sqsupseteq \beta, \quad then \quad \sum_k x_k \leq \sum_k y_k.$$

(Remark that all sums $\sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha}$ are *ordinary finite sums of real numbers.*)

DA ***Double sum axioms*:**

DA1 $\sum_h \sum_k x_{hk} = \sum_k \sum_h x_{hk} = \sum_i \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_{hk}$.

So we may denote any of these double sums by $\sum_{h,k} x_{hk}$.

DA2 *Let* $x_{hk} = 0$ *for* $h, k \geq \omega^j$*. Then*

$$\sum_{h,k} x_{hk} = \sum_i y_i \quad where \quad y_i = \begin{cases} x_{hk} & if \quad i = \omega^j \odot h + k \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}.$$

Surprisingly enough, these simple and natural axioms are all that is needed in order to endow $\mathbb{E}$ with a very rich structure, as we shall show in the sequel.

We begin with a few simple consequences.

- ***Double sum comparison:***
  $\sum_{i \sqsubseteq \alpha} \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_{hk} = \sum_{h,k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_{hk}$, hence, if there is $\beta \in \Omega$ such that

  $$\sum_{h,k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_{hk} \leq \sum_{h,k \sqsubseteq \alpha} y_{hk} \quad for\ all \quad \alpha \sqsupseteq \beta, \quad then \quad \sum_{h,k} x_{hk} \leq \sum_{h,k} y_{hk}.$$

- ***Translation invariance:***
  Let $x_k = 0$ for $k \geq \omega^j$. Then, for all $h \in \Omega$,

  $$\sum_k x_k = \sum_i y_i, \quad \text{where} \quad y_i = \begin{cases} x_k & if \quad i = \omega^j \odot h + k \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}.$$

  In fact, put $x_{lk} = \begin{cases} x_k & if \quad l = 0, h \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$. Then $x_{hk} = y_{\omega^j \odot h + k}$ and so, by $\mathbb{E}$-linearity and axiom DA2,

  $$\sum_l \sum_k x_{lk} = 2 \sum_k x_k = \sum_k x_k + \sum_i y_i$$

  .

- ***Product formula***:

$$(\sum_h x_h)(\sum_k y_k) = \sum_i \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_h y_k.$$

In fact, by $\mathbb{E}$-linearity

$$(\sum_h x_h)(\sum_k y_k) = \sum_k (\sum_h x_h) y_k = \sum_k \sum_h x_h y_k.$$

- ***Associativity***:

For $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega$ denote

$$\sum_{k \in [\alpha,\beta)} \xi_k = \sum_k \xi_k \left(\chi_\beta(k) - \chi_\alpha(k)\right) \text{ with } \chi_\gamma(k) = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \;\; k < \gamma \\ 0 \; if \;\; k \geq \gamma \end{cases}$$

Then the axiom DA2 yields, for all $\beta \in \Omega$,

$$\sum_{k \in [0, \omega^j \odot \beta)} x_k = \sum_{h \in [0,\beta)} \sum_{k \in [\omega^j \odot h, \, \omega^j \odot (h+1))} x_k.$$

Remark 2.1. The initial assumption that *sums of finitely many non-zero elements receive their natural values in* $\mathbb{E}$ could be deduced by combining $\mathbb{E}$-linearity of Σ with the axioms RA,CA, and the product formula: in fact such sums are equal to the costant sequence of their sum s in $\mathbb{E}$, by CA, hence equal to a multiple $\xi\, s$, by $\mathbb{E}$-linearity. Then $\xi^2 = \xi$ follows by the product formula, and so $\xi = 1$, again by CA.

Remark 2.2. The comparison axiom CA can be strengthened by replacing the Fréchet filter generated by the *cones* $C[\alpha] = \{\beta \in \Omega \mid \alpha \sqsubseteq \beta\}$ by a suitable stronger filter, so as to obtain further properties.

E.g. one can consider only ordinals of the form $\alpha \cdot n!$, so as to get suitable divisibility properties.

2.2 Ordinal numbers as Euclidean numbers

An important consequence of the axioms is the existence of a natural isomorphic embedding of Ω (as *ordered semiring* with *natural* sum and product) into $\mathbb{E}$:

Theorem 2.3. *Define* $\Psi : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}$ *by* $\Psi(\alpha) = \sum_k \chi_\alpha(k)$; *then:*

$$\Psi(\alpha + \beta) = \Psi(\alpha) + \Psi(\beta) \quad \textit{and} \quad \Psi(\alpha \cdot \beta) = \Psi(\alpha) \cdot \Psi(\beta).$$

Proof. In order to prove that $\Psi(\alpha + \beta) = \Psi(\alpha) + \Psi(\beta)$, it suffices to show that Ψ preserves the (decreasing) Cantor normal form, *i.e.*

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega^{j_i} \ (j_1 \geq j_2 \geq \ldots \geq j_n) \implies \Psi(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Psi(\omega^{j_i}),$$

and this follows by repeated application of the axiom DA2 to

$$\Psi(\omega^j) + \Psi(\omega^h) = \sum_{k \in [0, \omega^j)} 1_k + \sum_{k \in [0, \omega^h)} 1_k = \sum_{i \in [0, \omega^j + \omega^h)} 1_i = \Psi(\omega^j + \omega^h),$$

where 1_j denotes the constant function 1.

Moreover, by distributivity, the multiplicative property $\Psi(\alpha \cdot \beta) = \Psi(\alpha) \cdot \Psi(\beta)$ needs to be proved only for ordinals of the form $\omega^\alpha = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \delta_{j_n}^{a_n}$.

Now, for a pure power δ_j^a the equality $\Psi(\delta_j^a) = \Psi(\delta_j)^a$ follows by induction on a, by applying associativity and product formula:

$$\Psi(\delta_j^{a+1}) = \sum_{k \in [0, \delta_j^a \odot \delta_j)} 1_k = \sum_{h \in [0, \delta_j)} \ \sum_{k \in [\delta_j^a \odot h,\, \delta_j^a \odot (h+1))} 1_k =$$

$$= \sum_h \sum_k \chi_{\delta_j^a}(k) \chi_{\delta_j}(h) = \Psi(\delta_j^a) \Psi(\delta_j)$$

The same argument can be iterated N times in order to obtain

$$\Psi\left(\prod_{n=1}^{N} \delta_{j_n}^{a_n} \right) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \Psi(\delta_{j_n})^{a_n}.$$

□

By virtue of this theorem, we shall identify each ordinal $\alpha \in \Omega$ with the corresponding Euclidean number $\Psi(\alpha)$, so as to obtain that $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, exactly as we have assumed $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$. Since we prefer to have the field $\mathbb{E}$ as a *set of atoms*, we have viewed from the beginning each ordinal number $\alpha \in \Omega$ *"à la Cantor"* as *the order-type of*, and not *"à la Von Neumann"* as *identified with* the corresponding initial segment

$$\Omega_\alpha = \{\beta \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{E} \mid \beta < \alpha\}.$$

Remark 2.4. The meaning of the *natural product* between ordinal numbers, defined through order types, is quite involved and *not intuitive* at all. On the contrary, thinking of an ordinal number as an *Euclidean number*, namely as a *transfinite sum of ones*, makes appear quite natural the meaning of the product, as given by the the product formula. Also the natural ordering of the ordinals coincides with that induced by $\mathbb{E}$, by the Comparison axiom, because they are transfinite sums of ones without zeroes in between.

Remark 2.5. If the comparison axiom is strengthened by considering the filter $\mathcal{F}$ obtained by concentrating the Fréchet filter on the set of the ordinals $n!\alpha$ (see Remark 2.2), we obtain that

- *every γ-number is congruent to* 1 *modulo all natural numbers, i.e.*

$$\forall j \in \Omega\, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\, \exists \beta\ (\omega^j = n\beta + 1)$$

In fact, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, put $\beta_i = \sum_k b_{ik}$ where $b_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = \omega \odot h + qn + i < \omega^j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$: then

$$\omega^j = \sum_k \chi_{\omega^j}(k) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i = 1 + n\beta_n$$

because $\sum_{k \sqsubseteq n!\alpha} b_{ik} = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq n!\alpha} b_{nk}$ for all i and all α.

2.3 The counting functions

The map Σ associates to each eventually zero Ω-sequence of real numbers $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ its *transfinite sum* $\Sigma(x) = \sum_k x_k \in \mathbb{E}$. We now associate to each $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ a different Ω-sequence of real numbers, its *counting function*:[4]

[4] The relevance of the counting functions will result in Subsection 2.4, where it will become apparent that the *counting function* plays (for *transfinite sums*) the role played

Definition 2.1. The *counting function* of the Ω-sequence $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ is the function $\varphi_x : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\varphi_x(\alpha) = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_k \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \Omega.$$

The counting functions turn out to be "periodic". More precisely, given a set X, denote by

$$\mathscr{B}(\Omega, X) = \left\{ \psi \in X^\Omega \mid \exists j \in \Omega \, \forall \beta \in \Omega \, . \, \psi(\beta) = \psi(\langle \beta \rangle_j) \right\},$$

or equivalently, $\psi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, X)$ if and only if there is $j \in \Omega$ such that

$$\psi(\omega^j \odot h + \alpha) = \psi(\alpha) \text{ for all } \alpha < \omega^j \text{ and all } h \in \Omega.$$

Then we have

Theorem 2.6. *Let $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$.*

1. *If $x_k = 0$ for all $k \geq \omega^j$, then $\sum_{k \sqsubseteq (\omega^j \odot h + \alpha)} x_k = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_k$. Hence*

$$\varphi_x(\omega^j \odot h + \alpha) = \varphi_x(\alpha),$$

   for all $\alpha < \omega^j$ and all $h \in \Omega$, and so $\varphi_x \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$.

2. *Conversely, for all $\psi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, there exists a unique $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\psi = \varphi_x$.*
   Therefore $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ coincides with the set of all counting functions.

Proof.

The first assertion follows from the definition of the relation $\sqsubseteq$, because, for $k < \omega^j$, one has $k \sqsubseteq \omega^j \odot h + \alpha$ if and only if $k \sqsubseteq \alpha$, as stated by the criterion (C) of Subsection 1.3. Hence any counting function is periodic, *i.e.* it belongs to $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$.

In order to prove the converse, assume that $\psi(\omega^j \odot h + \alpha) = \psi(\alpha)$ for all $h \in \Omega$ and all $\alpha < \omega^j$. Define by induction

$$x_0 = \psi(0) \quad \text{and} \quad x_\alpha = \psi(\alpha) - \sum_{k \sqsubset \alpha} x_k :$$

---

by the sequence of the *partial sums* for the *usual series*.

On the other hand, the qualification "counting" is due to their meaning in the theory of numerosities developed in Section 4.

then $\varphi_x = \psi$, and clearly x is uniquely defined.

We prove that $x_\alpha = 0$ for $\alpha \geq \omega^j$, so $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega)$. Clearly

$$x_{\omega^j} = \psi(\omega^j) - \sum_{k \sqsubset \omega^j} x_k = \psi(0) - x_0 = 0.$$

Assume by induction that $x_\beta = 0$ for $\omega^j \leq \beta < \omega^j \odot h + \alpha$, and recall that, for all $k, \alpha < \omega^j$ and $h \geq 1$,

$$k \sqsubset (\omega^j \odot h + \alpha) \iff k \sqsubseteq \alpha.$$

Then, for $h \geq 1$ and $\alpha < \omega^j$, one has

$$x_{\omega^j \odot h + \alpha} = \psi(\omega^j \odot h + \alpha) - \sum_{k \sqsubset (\omega^j \odot h + \alpha)} x_k = \psi(\alpha) - \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_k = 0$$

□

The above lemma has an important consequence:

Theorem 2.7. *Define the map $J : \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{E}$ by $J(\varphi_x) = \Sigma(x)$. Then J is an $\mathbb{R}$-algebra homomorphism onto the ordered field $\mathbb{E}$.*

Proof. First of all, for any $\psi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ there is a unique $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\psi = \varphi_x$, namely the one given in the proof of Theorem 2.6, satisfying $x_\alpha = \psi(\alpha) - \sum_{k \sqsubset \alpha} x_k$. Hence the map J is well defined.

The map Σ being $\mathbb{E}$-linear, J preserves linear combinations over $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover, by the axiom RA, the range of J is the whole field $\mathbb{E}$.

Finally, given $x, y \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, put $z_i = \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_k y_h$, so that, by the Product formula, $\Sigma(x) \cdot \Sigma(y) = \Sigma(z)$. Then, for all $\alpha \in \Omega$,

$$(\varphi_x \cdot \varphi_y)(\alpha) = \varphi_x(\alpha) \cdot \varphi_y(\alpha) = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_k \cdot \sum_{h \sqsubseteq \alpha} y_h =$$

$$= \sum_{h,k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_k y_h = \sum_{i \sqsubseteq \alpha} z_i = \varphi_z(\alpha)$$

and so also products are preserved.

□

Remark 2.8. The kernel of J is a *maximal ideal* determined by its *idempotents*, so there is an *ultrafilter* $\mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ on Ω such that

$$\varphi \in \ker J \iff \{\beta \in \Omega \mid \varphi(\beta) = 0\} \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega), \qquad (\mathbf{U.1})$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_k x_k = 0 \iff \{\alpha \in \Omega \mid \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_k = 0\} \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega). \qquad (\mathbf{U.2})$$

This fact will be basic in the constuction of the Euclidean field given in Subsection 5.3.

We can extend the definition of the counting function to the set $\mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ of all eventually 0 Ω-sequences of Euclidean numbers in the natural way

Definition 2.2. The *counting function* of the Ω-sequence $\xi \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ is the function $\varphi_\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}^\Omega$ such that

$$\varphi_\xi(\alpha) = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} \xi_k \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Omega.$$

The defining sums are ordinary sums in the field $\mathbb{E}$, so the same argument used in the proof of Theorem 2.6 yields that

$$\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{E}) = \{\, \varphi_\xi \mid \xi \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E}) \,\}.$$

We can naturally extend the homomorphism J to the whole algebra $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$, and obtain

Corollary 2.3. *The map* $J_{\mathbb{E}} : \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{E}) \to \mathbb{E}$ *defined by*

$$J_{\mathbb{E}}(\varphi_\xi) = \sum_k \xi_k \quad \textit{for all} \quad \xi \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$$

is an $\mathbb{E}$*-algebra homomorphism onto the ordered field* $\mathbb{E}$. □

CAVEAT. The kernel of the map $J_{\mathbb{E}}$ is a maximal ideal of $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ such that $(\ker J_{\mathbb{E}}) \cap \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) = \ker J$. But it is not a *zero-ideal*, so it is not definable through an ultrafilter on Ω by extending the conditions $(U.1), (U.2)$ above to transfinite sums of general Euclidean numbers.

In fact there exist counting functions $\varphi \in \ker J_{\mathbb{E}}$ which are *everywhere non-zero*, *e.g.* take $\varphi(\omega \odot h + n) = \omega - n - 1$ for all $h \in \Omega$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.4 The topology of the Euclidean numbers

The *counting function* φ_ξ of a sequence $\xi \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ satisfies

$$\varphi_\xi(\alpha) = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} \xi_k. \tag{2.1}$$

So it can be viewed as the Ω-sequence of the *(finite) partial sums* of the transfinite sum $\sum_k \xi_k$; thus we would like to write

$$\sum_k \xi_k = \lim_{\eta \uparrow \Lambda} \varphi_\xi(\eta) \tag{2.2}$$

where the limit should be taken according to suitable toplogies both on $\mathbb{E}$ and on an appropriate completion $\Omega' = \Omega \cup \{\Lambda\}$ of Ω.

The natural *order topology*[5] of the ordered field $\mathbb{E}$ turns out to be inappropriate, for it induces on $\mathbb{R}$ the *discrete* topology. So we define a different topology $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$, namely

Definition 2.4. If $A \subset \mathbb{E}$, put

$$\mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, A) := \{\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{E}) \mid \exists Q \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)\, \forall \eta \in Q\ \varphi(\eta) \in A\}\,;$$

A set $F \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ is $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$-*closed* if and only if $J(\varphi)$ belongs to F for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, F)$.[6]

The sets so defined are indeed the family of the closed sets of a topology,[7] namely

- $\emptyset$ and $\mathbb{E}$ are $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$-closed
- if F and G are $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$-closed, then $F \cup G$ is $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$-closed
- if $\{F_\ell\}_{\ell \in L}$ is a family of closed set, then $\bigcap_{\ell \in L} F_\ell$ is closed.

[5] The order topology is a *uniform topology with a nested uniformity basis* given by the sets $U_\epsilon = \{(\xi, \eta) \mid |\eta - \xi| < \epsilon\}$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbb{E}^+$.

[6] So it should result that F is closed if and only if it contains the limits of all Ω-sequences in $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, F)$.

[7] If the field $\mathbb{E}$ is considered as a nonstandard extension of $\mathbb{R}$, as we shall see in the next section, then $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$ is the so called S-topology. It has an open basis given by the (clopen) sets $A^* = \mathscr{B}(\Omega, A)$ for all $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

It remains to define the filter $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$ of the neighboroods of Λ. The topological role of the point "at infinity" Λ is not to be confused with that of the first inaccessible cardinal: rather, it should be identified with an appropriate point of the Stone-Cech compactification $\beta(\Omega)$ of Ω.[8] To this aim, we simply attach the new point Λ to each qualified set of the ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ defined above (see (**U.1**)(**U.2**)):

$$\mathcal{U}(\Lambda) = \{Q \cup \{\Lambda\} \mid Q \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)\}.$$

The given definitions yield immediately the following

Theorem 2.9. *Take on $\mathbb{E}$ the topology $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$ and take $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$ as the filter of neighboroods of Λ (in $\Omega \cup \{\Lambda\}$). Then the corresponding limit of the Ω-sequence $\varphi_\xi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ is*

$$\lim_{\eta \uparrow \Lambda} \varphi_\xi(\eta) = \sum_k \xi_k = J(\varphi_\xi).$$

□

Actually, $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$ is the *finest topology* that makes it possible to extend all the Ω-sequences in $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ to be *continuous at the point* Λ with respect to the filter of neighborhoods $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$.

Call Λ-*limit* the limit so defined. Then the following properties hold by definition:

(Λ.1) **Existence and uniqueness:**
Every $\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ has a unique Λ-limit $\lim_{\eta \uparrow \Lambda} \varphi(\eta) = \xi \in \mathbb{E}$,
and every $\xi \in \mathbb{E}$ is the Λ-limit of some net $\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$.

(Λ.2) **Real numbers preservation**:

$$(\exists \eta_0 \in \Omega \; \forall \eta \sqsupseteq \eta_0 \,.\; \varphi(\eta) = r) \implies \lim_{\eta \uparrow \Lambda} \varphi(\eta) = r$$

[8] Remark that $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$ induces on the *subset* $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ the *discrete* topology, which is obviously finer than the *order topology of the ordinals*, but agrees with it on the set Ω^+ of the *successor* ordinals, or on the set $\mathfrak{Q}$ of the *complete* ordinals. However this fact does not matter in defining the limit at the *new point* Λ, which *cannot* have a neighborhood basis containing only *final segments* of Ω^+ or $\mathfrak{Q}$.

(Λ.3) **Sum and product preservation**: For all $\varphi, \psi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta\uparrow\Lambda} \varphi(\eta) + \lim_{\eta\uparrow\Lambda} \psi(\eta) &= \lim_{\eta\uparrow\Lambda} (\varphi(\eta) + \psi(\eta)) \\ \lim_{\eta\uparrow\Lambda} \varphi(\eta) \cdot \lim_{\eta\uparrow\Lambda} \psi(\eta) &= \lim_{\eta\uparrow\Lambda} (\varphi(\eta) \cdot \psi(\eta)) \end{aligned}$$

The properties (Λ.1-3) are assumed as axioms in [3] (with an appropriate directed set Λ replacing Ω), thus providing a different approach to Nostandard Analysis, called Λ-theory, usuful for the applications. The theory of the Euclidean numbers, having more structure, is *a fortiori* suitable to this aim: the next section is devoted to this developement.

3 Euclidean numbers and Nonstandard Analysis

In this section we show that the Euclidean numbers are hyperreal numbers, actually they are the *unique saturated field of hyperreal numbers with the cardinality of* Ω.

3.1 Hyperreal fields

Many different approaches to Nonstandtard Analysis can be found in the literature, see in particular [23, 20, 8] and the bibliography therein. For completeness, we briefly recall here the basic definitions of the superstructure approach.

Definition 3.1. For any set X of atoms, the *superstructure over* X is the set

$$V_\omega(X) = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} V_n(X)$$

where

$$V_0(X) = X \quad \text{and} \quad V_{n+1}(X) = V_n(X) \cup \mathcal{P}(V_n(X))$$

Definition 3.2. Given a field $\mathbb{F} \supset \mathbb{R}$, a *nonstandard embedding* is a mapping

$$* : V_\omega(\mathbb{R}) \to V_\omega(\mathbb{F}); \tag{3.1}$$

that satisfies the *Leibniz transfer principle*, *i.e.*

$$\rho(a_1, ..., a_n) \Longleftrightarrow \rho(a_1^*, ..., a_n^*)$$

for all *bounded quantifier formulæ*[9] $\rho(x_1, ..., x_n)$ and all $a_1, ..., a_n \in V_\omega(\mathbb{R})$.

Moreover, it is assumed that $r^* = r$ for every $r \in \mathbb{R}$, that $\mathbb{R}^* = \mathbb{F}$, and that $\mathbb{F}$ is a set of *atoms*.

Given a nonstandard embedding $* : V_\omega(\mathbb{R}) \to V_\omega(\mathbb{F})$, the triple $(*, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F})$ is called *hyperreal number system*, and the field $\mathbb{F}$ is called *hyperreal field*.

3.2 The Euclidean numbers as hyperreal numbers

In this section we show that $\mathbb{E}$ is a *hyperreal field* by giving an explicit definition of the map $*$ in (3.1). This is one of the reasons why we have assumed that the Euclidean numbers are *atoms*.

Definition 3.3. Given any set S, a real algebra of functions $\mathfrak{F}(S, \mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}^S$ is called *composable* if

$$\forall f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}} \ \forall \varphi \in \mathfrak{F}(S, \mathbb{R}) \ . \ f \circ \varphi \in \mathfrak{F}(S, \mathbb{R}) .$$

Recall the following theorem of Benci and Di Nasso:

Theorem 3.1 ([5], Thm. 3.3)**.** *A field $\mathbb{F}$ is a hyperreal field if and only if there exist a set S, a composable algebra of functions $\mathfrak{F}(S, \mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}^S$, and a surjective homorphism $J : \mathfrak{F}(S, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{F}$.*

Applying this theorem together with Corollary 2.7, we immediately get:

Theorem 3.2. *The algebra $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ is composable, hence $\mathbb{E}$ is a hyperreal field.* □

Now we define explicitely the map $*$ and some other notions of Nonstandard Analysis by applying the Λ-limit introduced in Subsection 2.4.

Definition 3.4. Given a periodic Ω-sequence $\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, V_n(\mathbb{R}))$, define by induction its Λ-limit $\lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \varphi(\xi)$ as follows:

[9] By *bounded quantifier formula* we mean a first-order formula in the language $\mathcal{L} = \{\in\}$ of set theory, where all quantifieers occur in the bounded forms $\forall x \in y$ or $\exists x \in y$.

- for $n = 0$, the limit $\lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \varphi(\xi) = J(\varphi)$ has been defined by Thm.2.9;

  so, assuming the limit defined for n, put, for $\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, V_{n+1}(\mathbb{R}))$:

- $\lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \varphi(\xi) = \left\{ \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \psi(\xi) \mid \psi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, V_n(\mathbb{R})) \text{ and } \forall \xi \in \Omega,\ \psi(\xi) \in \varphi(\xi) \right\}$.

- A set in $V_\omega(\mathbb{E})$ which is the Λ-limit of an Ω-sequence is called *internal*.

- A *mathematical entity* (number, set, function or relation), when identified with a set in $V_\omega(\mathbb{E})$, is called *internal* if the corresponding set is internal.

Now we can define the $*$-map.

Definition 3.5. If $r \in \mathbb{R}$, then $r^* = r$. If $E \in V_\omega(\mathbb{R})$ is a set, then the *star extension* E^* of E is

$$E^* := \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} c_E(\xi) = \left\{ \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \psi(\xi) \mid \psi(\xi) \in E \right\} = \{ J(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, E) \}$$

where $c_E(\xi)$ is the sequence identically equal to E.

Remark that, when $E \subset \mathbb{R}$, then the *star extension* E^* of E is the *closure* of E in $\mathbb{E}$ with respect to the $\tau_{\mathbb{E}}$ topology.

This appoach to Nonstandard Analysis being based on the notion of limit, it is natural to formulate the Leibniz principle in the following apparently stronger form:

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\rho(x_1, ..., x_n)$ be a bounded quantifier formula and let $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n$ be Ω-sequences in $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, V_N(\mathbb{R}))$, with $N \in \mathbb{N}$; then*

$$(\exists Q \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)\ \forall \xi \in Q\,.\,\rho(\varphi_1(\xi), ..., \varphi_n(\xi))) \iff \rho\left(\lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \varphi_1(\xi), ..., \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \varphi_n(\xi) \right)$$

Proof. The proof is a simple adaptation of the usual proof (see *e.g.* [20]).

□

Clearly the Leibniz principle as formulated in Def. 3.2 follows by taking constant sequences in the above proposition. Let us deduce two important corollaries:

Corollary 3.7. *The Euclidean number field* $\mathbb{E}$ *is a real closed field.*

Proof. Since $\mathbb{R}$ is real closed, then also $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{R}^*$ is real closed. □

Another immediate consequence of Leibniz principle is that $\mathbb{E}$, as ordered field, is *unique* in the following sense:

Corollary 3.8. *If* $\mathbb{F}$ *is a real closed field having cardinality* Ω*, then* $\mathbb{F}$ *is isomorphic to* $\mathbb{E}$*.*

Proof. Apply Coroll. 3.7 and the fact that two real closed fields are isomorphic if and only if they share the same *absolute trascendency* degree. (See *e.g.* [14], p. 348.) □

Remark 3.3. If, instead of the first inaccessible number, we take Ω to be the class of all ordinals, then the field of Euclidean numbers $\mathbb{E}$ is isomorphic to the field of *surreal numbers* **No** of Conway [15]; so, following Ehrlich [17] they form an *absolute arithmetic continuum.*

3.3 Saturation

Recall the usual definiton of saturated field in Nonstandard Analysis:

Definition 3.9. A hyperreal number system $(*, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F})$ is *saturated* if any family of *internal* sets $\mathcal{E} = \{E_k \mid k \in K\}$ of size $|K| < |\mathbb{F}|$, with the *finite intersection property*[10] FIP, has a nonempty intersection.

Theorem 3.4. *The Euclidean number system* $(*, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{E})$ *is saturated.*

Proof. Let $\{E_k\}_{k\in K}$, $|K| < |\Omega|$, be a family of internal sets with the FIP. Recall that each internal set is the Λ-limit of a periodic function $\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$. The ordinal Ω being regular and greater than $2^{\aleph_0}$, the periods are bounded by ω^j, say. So we assume w.l.o.g. that $E_k = \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} E_{k,\xi}$, with $\mathbb{R} \supseteq E_{k,\xi} = E_{k,\langle\xi\rangle_j}$ for all $k \in K$. For sake of simplicity we assume that also the index set is a segment of ordinals, say $K = \{k \in \Omega \mid k < \omega^j\}$, and we put

$$E_k = E_{\langle k\rangle_j} \text{ if } k \geq \omega^j,$$

so as to have E_k periodically defined for all $k \in \Omega$.

[10] The FIP says thet every finite subfamily of $\mathcal{E}$ has nonempty intersection.

By FIP, the internal sets $B_\mu := \bigcap_{k \sqsubseteq \mu} E_k$ are nonempty for all $\mu \in \Omega$. Remark that we have extended the definition of the sets E_k to all $k \in \Omega$ in such a way that every set B_μ coincides with $B_{\langle \mu \rangle_j}$ The sets B_μ being internal and nonempty, there exists for each μ a family of nonempty sets $\langle B_{\mu,\xi} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \mid \xi \in \Omega \rangle$ such that

$$B_\mu = \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} B_{\mu,\xi}.$$

So for each μ there exists a sequence

$$\varphi_\mu \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) \text{ such that } \forall \xi \,.\, \varphi_\mu(\xi) \in B_{\mu,\xi}$$

Moreover, by our assumptions, we may choose the functions φ_μ so that

$$\varphi_\mu(\xi) = \varphi_{\langle \mu \rangle_j}(\langle \xi \rangle_j).$$

Now define $\psi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ by putting, for $s < \omega^j$,

$$\psi(\omega^j \odot \mu + s) := \varphi_\mu(s), \text{ so that } \forall \mu \in \Omega \; \forall s < \omega^j \,.\, \psi(\omega^j \odot \mu + s) \in B_{\mu,s}.$$

Then $\psi(\xi) \in B_{\mu,\xi}$ for all $\xi \in \Omega$, hence

$$b = \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \psi(\xi) \in \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} B_{\mu,\xi} = B_\mu \text{ for all } \mu \in \Omega,$$

and so $b \in \bigcap_{\mu \in \Omega} B_\mu = \bigcap_{k \in K} E_k$, which is therefore nonempty.

□

3.4 The Keisler hyperreal field

Following Keisler we give the following definition of isomorphism between hyperreal fields: .

Definition 3.10. Let $(*, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^*)$ and $(\circledast, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^\circledast)$ be hyperreal number systems with the same real part $\mathbb{R}$. A map $h : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^\circledast$ is an *isomorphism* if the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (i) $h(r) = r$ for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$,
- (ii) h is an *ordered field isomorphism* from $\mathbb{R}^*$ onto $\mathbb{R}^\circledast$,

- (iii) For each real function f of n variables and all $x_1, ..., x_n \in \mathbb{R}^*$,

$$f^{\circledast}(h(x_1), ..., h(x_n)) = h\left(f^*(x_1, ..., x_n)\right)$$

Two hyperreal number systems are *isomorphic* if there is an isomorphism between them.

In the set theory ZFC plus the Axiom of Inaccessibility, one can prove the following theorem:

Theorem 3.5 ([20], p.196)**.** *There is a definable*[11] *hyperreal number system* $(\bullet; \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^\bullet)$ *which is saturated and such that the cardinality of* $\mathbb{R}^\bullet$ *is the first uncountable inaccessible cardinal.* □

We shall refer to the field $\mathbb{R}^\bullet$ as the *hyperreal Keisler field*.

According to Thm. 3.4, we have the following interesting result:

Corollary 3.11. *The Euclidean number system* $(*, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{E})$ *is isomorphic to the hyperreal Keisler field* $(\bullet; \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^\bullet)$. □

3.5 Ω versus $\mathbb{N}^*$

As an ordered field, the Euclidean field $\mathbb{E}$ is unique, and it defines a *hyperreal number system* $(*, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{E})$ which is unique up to isomorphism, by Corollary 3.11. In addition, the Euclidean field $\mathbb{E}$ has two main extra properties which are not shared by other hyperreal fileds:

- *the sum of infinitely many hyperreal numbers is well defined*;
- *the semiring of the accessible ordinals* Ω *is isomorphically embedded in* $\mathbb{E}$ *in a natural way.*

The combination of these features creates new phenomena which we now investigate.

Proposition 3.12. *The natural embedding* $\Psi : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}$ *is defined by*

$$\Psi(\alpha) = \sum_k \chi_\alpha(k) = \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \varphi_\alpha(\xi)$$

[11] Recall that a set X is (first order) definable if there is a first order formula $\rho(x)$ such that X is the unique set such that $\rho(X)$ holds.

where

$$\varphi_\alpha(\xi) = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \xi} \chi_\alpha(k) = |\{k \in [0, \alpha) \mid k \sqsubseteq \xi\}| \,. \tag{3.2}$$

Hence it is an isomorphic embedding of Ω *into* $\mathbb{N}^*$ *(as ordered semirings).*

Proof. By definition,

$$\mathbb{N}^* = \left\{ \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \varphi(\xi) \mid \varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{N}) \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$$

hence $\mathbb{N}^* \supset \Psi[\Omega]$, because the counting function φ_α of $\Psi(\alpha) = \sum_k \chi_\alpha(k)$ takes its values in $\mathbb{N}$.

□

Thus the ordinal numbers in Ω can be viewed as "special" *hypernatural numbers*. In order to investigate the relation of general hypernatural numbers with ordinal numbers, put, for $\xi \in \Omega$,

$$K(\xi) = \{\alpha \in \Omega \mid \alpha \sqsubseteq \xi\} \,, \quad m(\xi) = |K(\xi)|, \text{ and } \mathbb{N}_m = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \leq m\} \,.$$

For $n \leq m(\xi)$, let $j_\xi(n)$ be the n-th element in the ordering of $K(\xi)$. Then $j_\xi : \mathbb{N}_{m(\xi)} \to K(\xi)$ is an order-preserving surjection; in particular $j_\xi(0) = 0$ and $j_\xi(m(\xi)) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in \Omega$.

Take the Λ-limits

$$K := \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} K(\xi) \subseteq \Omega^*; \quad \Lambda := \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \xi \ \in \Omega^*; \quad \mu = \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} m(\xi) \,; \tag{3.3}$$

$$\mathbb{N}^*_\mu := \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \mathbb{N}_{m(\xi)} \,; \quad \text{and} \quad j := \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} j_\xi \,. \tag{3.4}$$

Then, by Leibniz principle,

$$\Omega \subset K = \{\xi \in \Omega^* \mid \xi \sqsubseteq \Lambda\} \,, \quad \mathbb{N}^*_\mu = \{k \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid k \leq \mu\} \,, \quad \text{and} \quad j : \ \mathbb{N}^*_\mu \to K$$

is an order-preserving surjection such that $j_{|\Psi(\Omega)} = \Psi^{-1}$.

3.6 Hyperfinite sums v/s transfinite sums

In Nonstandard Analysis one deals with particular infinite sums, usually indexed by closed initial segments of the set $\mathbb{N}^*$ of the nonstandard natural numbers. We consider in this subsection the relations between these *hyperfinite* sums of the NSA and the *transfinite* sums of the Euclidean field $\mathbb{E}$ introduced in Section 2.

Definition 3.13. An internal set $F \in V_\omega(\mathbb{E})$ is called *hyperfinite* if it is the Λ-*limit of finite sets*, namely

$$F := \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} F_\xi = \left\{ \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} x_\xi \mid x_\xi \in F_\xi \right\}$$

where the F_ξs are finite.

E.g., for $\mu = \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} m_\xi \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the set $\mathbb{N}^*_\mu = \{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid \nu \leq \mu\}$ is hyperfinite, since $\mathbb{N}^*_\mu = \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \leq m_\xi\}$.

The notion of hyperfinite set is basic in defining the notion of *hyperfinite sum*, which is the usual notion of infinite sum of hyperreal numbers:

Definition 3.14. Given a hyperfinite set of hyperreal numbers $F \subset \mathbb{E}$, the *hyperfinite sum of the element of* F is defined as follows:

$$\sum_{x\in F}^{*} x = \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \left(\sum_{x\in F_\xi} x \right)$$

Transfinite sums and hyperfinite sums are strictly related, as the next theorem shows.

Theorem 3.6. *If $a \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, then*

$$\sum_k a_k = \sum_{x\in F^a}^{*} x$$

where the hyperfinite set F^a is defined as

$$F^a = \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} F^a_\xi \quad \textit{where} \quad F^a_\xi = \{a_k \mid k \sqsubseteq \xi\} \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. We have

$$\sum_k a_k = \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \sum_{k\sqsubseteq\xi} a_k = \lim_{\xi\uparrow\Lambda} \sum_{x\in F^a_\xi} x = \sum_{x\in F^a}^{*} x.$$

□

By the Leibniz principle, we have that a set $F \subset \mathbb{E}$ is hyperfinite if and only if there exist $a \in \left(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}\right)^*$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that

$$F = F_\mu^a := \{a_\nu \,|\, \nu \in \mathbb{N}^*, \nu \leq \mu\}.$$

This fact suggests the following notation:

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_\mu^*} a_\nu = \sum_{x \in F_\mu^a}^* x.$$

Given a sequence $a \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, put $S(n) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k$. Denote by $a^*, S^* \in \left(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}\right)^*$ the $*$-extensions of a, S respectively: then, for any hypernatural number $\mu \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the corresponding hyperfinite sum is

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_\mu^*}^* a_\nu^* = S^*(\mu),$$

by the Leibniz principle. In particular we have

Theorem 3.7.

$$\sum_{k \in [0,\omega)} a_k = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_{\omega-1}^*}^* a_\nu^* \quad for\ all \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

Proof. Let φ be the counting function of $\sum_{k \in [0,\omega)} a_k$, so

$$\varphi(\xi) = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \xi} a_k \chi_\omega(k) = \sum_{k=0}^{\langle \xi \rangle_1} a_k = S(\langle \xi \rangle_1) \quad \text{whence} \quad \sum_{k \in [0,\omega)} a_k = \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} S(\langle \xi \rangle_1).$$

We have taken $\omega = \sum_k \chi_\omega(k) = \lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \langle \xi + 1 \rangle_1$: then we have that

$$\sum_{k \in [0,\omega)} a_k = S^*\left(\lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \langle \xi \rangle_1\right) = S^*\left(\lim_{\xi \uparrow \Lambda} \langle \xi + 1 \rangle_1 - 1\right) = S^*(\omega - 1) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_{\omega-1}^*}^* a_\nu^*$$

□

E.g., compute the sum $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^k}$:

$$S(n) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{2^k} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}{1 - \frac{1}{2}} = 2 - \frac{1}{2^n}, \quad \text{hence} \quad \sum_{k \in [0,\omega)} \frac{1}{2^k} = 2 - \frac{1}{2^{\omega-1}} \tag{3.6}$$

This computation is "more accurate" than the usual value given to the series $\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} 2^{-k} = 2$, which neglects the infinitesimal $2^{1-\omega}$ in (3.6).

4 Numerosities

In the history of Mathematics the problem of comparing the size of objects has been extensively studied. In particular different methods of measuring sets, by associating to them suitable kinds of numbers, have been exploited. A satisfactory notion of measure for sets should be submitted to the famous five *common notions* of Euclid's Elements, which traditionally embody the properties of magnitudes (see [18]):

1. *Things equal to the same thing are also equal to one another.*
2. *And if equals be added to equals, the wholes are equal.*
3. *And if equals be subtracted from equals, the remainders are equal.*
4. *Things* applying onto *one another are equal to one another.*[12]
5. *The whole is greater than the part.*

To be sure, the Euclidean common notions seem *prima facie* unsuitable for measuring the size of arbitrary sets: the third and fifth notions are known to be incompatible with the very ground of the Cantorian theory of cardinality, namely the so called *Hume's Principle*

(HP) *Two sets have the same size if and only if there exists a biunique correspondence between them.*

This principle amounts to encompass the *largest* possible class of size preserving applications, namely *all bijections*. This fact might seem natural, and even *implicit in the notion of counting*; but it strongly violates the equally natural *Euclid's principle*

(EP) *A set is greater than its proper subsets,*

which in turn seems *implicit in the notion of size*. Be it as it may, the spectacular development of set theory in the entire twentieth century has put Euclid's principle in oblivion. Only the new millennium has seen a limited resurgence of proposals including (EP) at the cost of some limitations of (HP) (see *e.g.* [2, 4, 6, 7], or the excellent survey [22] and the references therein).

[12] Here we translate $\epsilon\phi\alpha\rho\mu o\zeta o\nu\tau\alpha$ by "applying onto", instead of the usual "coinciding with". As pointed out by T.L. Heath in his commentary [18], this translation seems to give a more appropriate rendering of the mathematical usage of the verb $\epsilon\phi\alpha\rho\mu o\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$.

4.1 Saving the five Euclidean common notions

It is worth noticing that taditional geometry satisfies the Euclidean common notions because there is a restricted class of "exact applications": *e.g.*, the *rigid equidecompositions* of polygons, or, more generally, when considering metric spaces, the *isometries*, *i.e.* distance preserving bijections. But, when dealing with general set theory, an appeal to the notion of distance seems inappropriate. So the question arises as to *which correspondences* can be taken as "exact applications" in order to fulfill the five Euclidean common notions.

Cantor himself, besides his cardinality theory based on general bijections, introduced another way of assigning numbers to sets, namely refined *cardinal* numbers to *ordinal* numbers. In this case one considers sets endowed with a *wellordering*, and restricts the "exact applications" to the order preserving bijections. However, while the ordinal arithmetic may respect the third common notion, nevertheless the Euclid's principle (EP) still badly fails.

The *Euclidean* numbers have been introduced above as an *extension* of the ordinals, suitable to provide a notion of size satisfying *all* the Euclidean common notions for an appropriate class of "labelled sets". A *labelled set* E comes together with a suitable *labelling map* ℓ such that $\ell^{-1}(x)$ is a *finite set* for all $x \in E$.

The original idea is that by putting an appropriate *labelling* on arbitrary sets, the *label preserving bijections* (intended as "exact applications") might produce exactly the "nonnegative integers" of the Euclidean numbers (whence their name).[13] Remark that a labelled set can be viewed as a generalization of a wellordered set, because the latter can be naturally labelled by the unique order isomorphism with an (initial segment of an) ordinal. In fact we shall see below that any labelled set is "equinumerous" to a *set of ordinals*.

Let us state the basic definitions.

Definition 4.1. A *labelled set* is a pair (E, ℓ), where

- E is a set of cardinality less than Ω, the set of the ordinals smaller than the first inaccessible cardinal;[14]

[13] A notion of *numerosity* for countable "labelled sets", whose elements come with suitable labels (given by natural numbers) was first presenteded in [2], and later developed in the paper [4]. It provides a notion of "number of elements" that fulfills the fifth Euclidean common notion, and produces particular *nonstandard integers*.

[14] We consider the ordinals in Ω as *Euclidean numbers* in $\mathbb{E}$, hence atoms, according to

- $\ell : E \to \Omega$ is a function (the *labelling function*) such that
  1. the set $\ell^{-1}(x)$ is finite for all $x \in \Omega$,
  2. $\ell(x) = x$ for all $x \in E \cap \Omega$.
- Two labelled sets (E_1, ℓ_1) and (E_2, ℓ_2) are *coherent* if

$$\ell_1(x) = \ell_2(x) \text{ for all } x \in E_1 \cap E_2.$$

- Two labelled sets (E_1, ℓ_1) and (E_2, ℓ_2) are *isomorphic* if there is a biunique map $\phi : E_1 \to E_2$ such that

$$\ell_2(\phi(x)) = \ell_1(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in E_1.$$

Remark 4.1. By Point 2, each initial segment Ω_α receives the *identity* as labelling function. Thus a labelled set can be viewed as a generalization of a well ordered set, because the latter can be naturally labelled by the unique order isomorphism with an (initial segment of an) ordinal. More generally, we shall see below that any labelled set is "equinumerous" to a *set of ordinals*.

Now we are ready to introduce our main notion:

Definition 4.2. The *Euclidean numerosity* of a labelled set (E, ℓ) is the number

$$\mathfrak{n}(E, \ell) = \sum_k |\ell^{-1}(k)| \in \mathbb{E}.$$

The Euclidean numerosity satisfies *the five Euclidean common notions* (whence the name), when they are interpreted in the natural way:

1. Two labelled sets are considered *equal* (in size) if they have the same numerosity;

2. The *addition* of two labelled sets (E_1, ℓ_1) and (E_2, ℓ_2) with $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$ is given by

$$(E_1 \cup E_2, \ell_1 \cup \ell_2) \quad \text{where} \quad (\ell_1 \cup \ell_2)(x) = \begin{cases} \ell_1(x) & if\ x \in E_1 \\ \ell_2(x) & if\ x \in E_2 \end{cases}$$

our stipulation following Thm.2.2; however, as far as the numerosity theories are concerned, the Von Neumenn ordinals would be equivalent.

3. The *subtraction* of two coherent labelled sets (E_1, ℓ_1) and (E_2, ℓ) with $E_1 \subset E_2$ is given by

$$\left(E_2 \setminus E_1, \ell_{|E_2 \setminus E_1}\right)$$

4. Two labelled sets *apply onto* one another is equivalent to say that they are isomorphic;

5. A *part* of a labelled set is just a (coherent) subset.

4.2 The Euclidean numerosity theories

There are three main *operations* which produce (possibly new) labelled sets:

Definition 4.3. The *basic operations* on labelled sets are the following:

1. **Subset -** A *subset* of a labelled set (E, ℓ) is a labelled set $\left(F, \ell_{|F}\right)$ where $F \subset E$;

2. **Union -** The *union* of two *coherent* labelled sets (E_1, ℓ_1), (E_2, ℓ_2) is the labelled set

$$(E_1 \cup E_2, \ell) \quad \text{where} \quad \ell(x) = \begin{cases} \ell_1(x) & if\ x \in E_1 \\ \ell_2(x) & if\ x \in E_2 \end{cases}$$

3. **Cartesian product -** The *Cartesian product* of two labelled sets (E_1, ℓ_1), (E_2, ℓ_2) is the labelled set

$$(E_1 \times E_2, \ell) \quad \text{where} \quad \ell(x_1, x_2) = \ell_1(x_1) \vee \ell_2(x_2)$$

Definition 4.4.

- A family $(\mathcal{A}, \ell)$ of (accessible) *pairwise coherent* labelled sets is *closed* if it is closed under the three basic operations of Def. 4.3
- a *Euclidean numerosity theory* is a pair $(\mathbb{U}, \mathfrak{n})$, where $\mathbb{U}$ is a *closed family* of labelled set and $\mathfrak{n} : \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{E}$ is the *Euclidean numerosity*.

Remark 4.2. Given a coherent family $(\mathcal{A}, \ell)$ of labelled sets, there exists a *least closed family* including $\mathcal{A}$, denoted by $\mathbb{U}(\mathcal{A}, \ell)$ and called the *closure of* $(\mathcal{A}, \ell)$ (or the closed family *generated by* $(\mathcal{A}, \ell)$). We omit the labelling function ℓ if it is clear from the context.

In particular, if $\mathcal{A} = \{X\}$, then we write $\mathbb{U}[X]$ for $\mathbb{U}(\mathcal{A})$. We also write $\mathbb{U}(\Omega)$ for $\mathbb{U}(\{\Omega_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Omega\})$.

Let us see some examples. Recall that we identify the natural numbers with the finite ordinal numbers, and the accessible ordinals with the corresponding Euclidean numbers.

- Let $F \subset \Omega$ be a *finite* set, then $\mathbb{U}[F]$ contains only finite sets and $\mathfrak{n}(E)$ is just the *cardinality* of the finite set E; in this case

$$\mathfrak{n}(\mathbb{U}[F]) = \mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{E};$$

- The "simplest" numerosity theory containing *infinite* sets is given by $(\mathbb{U}[\mathbb{N}],\, \mathfrak{n})$; in this case we have that

$$\mathfrak{n}(\mathbb{U}[\mathbb{N}]) \subseteq \{\phi(\omega) \in \mathbb{E} \,|\, \phi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{N}),\ \phi(\beta) = \phi(\langle\beta\rangle_1)\}\,;$$

- The *canonical numerosity theory* is given by $(\mathbb{U}(\Omega), \mathfrak{n}) = (\mathbb{U}(\{\Omega_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Omega\}),\, \mathfrak{n})$: this is the "simplest" theory which contains all the (accessible) ordinal numbers.

Let us state the main properties of a *Euclidean numerosity theory.*

Theorem 4.3. *Let* $(\mathbb{U}, \mathfrak{n})$ *be a Euclidean numerosity theory. Then*

- *each set in* $\mathbb{U}$ *is equinumerous to a set of ordinals, and one has, for all* $A, B \in \mathbb{U}$*:*

Sum-Difference	• $\mathfrak{n}(A \cup B) = \mathfrak{n}(A) + \mathfrak{n}(B) - \mathfrak{n}(A \cap B)$;
Part-Whole	• $A \subset B \Longrightarrow \mathfrak{n}(A) < \mathfrak{n}(B)$;
Cartesian Product	• $\mathfrak{n}(A \times B) = \mathfrak{n}(A) \cdot \mathfrak{n}(B)$;
Comparison	• *if the* 1*-to-*1 *map* $T : A \to B$ *preserves labels, then* $\mathfrak{n}(A) \leq \mathfrak{n}(B)$.

Moreover

- *If* $\Omega_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ *for all* $\alpha \in \Omega$*, then the set of numerosities* $\mathfrak{N} = \mathfrak{n}[\mathbb{U}(\mathcal{A})]$ *is a positive subsemiring of nonstandard integers, that generates the whole* $\mathbb{Z}^*$*, and one has*

Identity	• $\forall \alpha \in \Omega,\ \mathfrak{n}(\Omega_\alpha) = \alpha$,
Translation invariance	• $\forall E \subseteq \Omega_{\omega^j},\ \mathfrak{n}\left(\{\,\omega^j + \xi \mid \xi \in E\}\right) = \mathfrak{n}(E)$

Homothety invariance	• $\forall E \subseteq \Omega_{\delta_j},\ \mathfrak{n}\left(\{\delta_j \xi \mid \xi \in E\}\right) = \mathfrak{n}(E)$
Cartesian product	• $\forall \alpha, \beta \in \Omega,\ \mathfrak{n}(\Omega_\alpha \times \Omega_\beta) = \alpha\beta$

Proof.

All the assertions are straightforward consequences of the definitions and of the axioms of $\mathbb{E}$, except the first one. In order to prove that each set $E \in \mathbb{U}(\mathcal{A})$ is equinumerous to some set of ordinals, let δ be a δ-number greater than all labels of the set $E \in \mathbb{U}$: we define a suitable subset of Ω_{δ^2} equinumerous to E.

Let n_k be the number of elements of E with label k, so $\mathfrak{n}(E) = \sum_k n_k$.

Let $a_{hk} = c_{\delta \odot h + k} = \begin{cases} 1 & if \quad 0 \leq h < n_k \text{ and } k < \delta \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$.

Then $\sum_h a_{hk} = n_k$ for all k, and $\sum_l c_l = \sum_{h,k} a_{h\,k} = \sum_k n_k$. Clearly the latter is the numerosity of the set

$$L = \{l < \delta^2 \mid l = \delta \odot h + k,\ h < n_k,\ n_k > 0\},$$

and so $\mathfrak{n}(E) = \mathfrak{n}(L)$.

In particular, every transfinite sum $\sum_k n_k$ of nonnegative integers is the numerosity of a subset of some Ω_α. Then Theorem 2.6 yields that any periodic Ω-sequence in $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{Z})$ is the difference between the counting functions of two sets of ordinals. Hence $\mathfrak{n}[\mathbb{U}(\Omega)]$ generates the whole $\mathbb{Z}^*$.

□

Remark 4.4. Another interesting operation on labelled sets is

- **Finite parts** - The *set of the finite parts* of the labelled set (E, ℓ) is the labelled set $(\mathcal{P}_\omega(E),\ \vee\ell)$,[15] where $\vee\ell$ is defined as follows:

$$\vee\ell\left(\{a_1, ..., a_n\}\right) = \bigvee_{k=1}^{n} \ell(a_k)$$

If, as usual in axiomatic set theory, we identify the *ordered pair* (a, b) with the "Kuratowski doubleton" $\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}$, then, by the above definition,

$$\vee\ell(a, b) = \vee\ell\left(\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}\right) = \ell(a) \vee \ell(b).$$

[15] Here $\mathcal{P}_\omega(E)$ denotes the family of all finite subsets of E, also denoted by $[E]^{<\omega}$.

Hence, if (E_1, ℓ_1) and (E_2, ℓ_2) are labelled sets, their Cartesian product is precisely the labelled set $(E_1 \times E_2, \ell_1 \vee \ell_2)$.

It is easily seen that, if the family $\mathbb{U}$ of the Euclidean numerosity theory $(\mathbb{U}, \mathfrak{n})$ is closed also under the operation of finithe parts, then one has

Finite parts • $\mathfrak{n}(\mathcal{P}_\omega(A)) = 2^{\mathfrak{n}(A)}$.

4.3 Euclidean numerosity v/s Aristotelian size

The Eucldean numerosity theory $(\mathbb{U}(\Omega), \mathfrak{n})$ of the preceding section might be compared with the "Aristotelian" numerosity theory introduced in [6], where in particular every set of ordinals A receives a numerosity $\mathfrak{s}(A)$ belonging to the non-negative part of an ordered ring $\mathfrak{A}$ so that the following conditions are fulfilled:

(sp) If $A \cap B = \emptyset$, then $\mathfrak{s}(A \cup B) = \mathfrak{s}(A) + \mathfrak{s}(B)$;

(up) $\mathfrak{s}(\{\xi\}) = 1$ for all ξ;

(fpp) If $A \subseteq \Omega_{\omega^j}$ and $B \subseteq \Omega_{\delta^h}$ with $\omega^j = \prod_1^N \delta_n$ and $\delta = \min(\delta_n \mid 1 \leq n \leq N)$, then

$$\mathfrak{s}(A) \cdot \mathfrak{s}(B) = \mathfrak{s}(\{\omega^j \odot \beta + \alpha \mid \alpha \in A, \beta \in B\}).$$

(For convenience we use here the notation of this article. Moreover we restrict ourselves to sets of *accessible ordinals* less than Ω, so as to avoid the use of *proper class-functions*.)

Theorem 4.3 above immediately implies that these properties are fulfilled by the Euclidean numerosity. Conversely, one can define a *transfinite sum of non-negative integers* in the ring $\mathfrak{A}$, by proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 4.3:

$$\sum_{k<\omega^j} n_k = \mathfrak{s}(L), \quad where \quad L = \{\omega^j \odot m + k \mid 0 \leq m < n_k \neq 0,\, k < \omega^j\}$$

This transfinite sum may be uniquely extended to arbitrary integers by considering separately positive and negative summands. We may assume w.l.o.g. that the ring $\mathfrak{A}$ is generated by the set of the numerosities, *i.e.* that any $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{A}$ is the *difference* $\mathfrak{s}(A) - \mathfrak{s}(B)$ of the numerosities of two sets of ordinals: then $\mathfrak{A}$ becomes the set of all transfinite sums of integers.

It turns out that the axiom CA holds in $\mathfrak{A}$ for the transfinite sums of integers. In fact, put $A_\alpha = \{x \in A \mid x \sqsubseteq \alpha\}$: then $|A_\alpha| = |B_\alpha|$ for all $\alpha \sqsupseteq \beta$ implies $A \setminus A_\beta = B \setminus B_\beta$ and $|A_\beta| = |B_\beta|$, hence $\mathfrak{s}(E) = \mathfrak{s}(F)$.

Moreover the property (fpp) can be used in defining the numerosity of Cartesian products. Then a natural strengthening of the property (fpp) could be the assumption that $\mathfrak{s}$ is definable on *sets of pairs* of ordinals by putting

$$\mathfrak{s}\,(E) = \mathfrak{s}(\{\omega^j \cdot \beta + \alpha \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in E\}) \text{ for all } \mathrm{E} \subseteq \Omega_{\omega^j} \times \Omega_{\omega^j}$$ [16]

On the other hand, the natural labelling of pairs given in the preceding subsection would give to E the numerosity

$$\mathfrak{s}(E) = \sum_k |E(k)| \quad \text{where} \quad E(k) = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in E \mid \alpha \vee \beta = k\},$$

i.e., according to the above definition,

$$\mathfrak{s}(E) = \mathfrak{s}(\{\omega^j \cdot m + k \mid 0 \leq m < |E(k)|, k < \omega^j\}.$$

So we are led to the following

Definition 4.5. Call *multiplicative* an Aristotelian numerosity $\mathfrak{s}$ such that following equality holds for all $E \subseteq \Omega_{\omega^j} \times \Omega_{\omega^j}$

(dsp) $\mathfrak{s}(\{\omega^j \cdot \beta + \alpha \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in E\}) = \mathfrak{s}(\{\omega^j \cdot m + \alpha \vee \beta \mid 0 \leq m < |E(\alpha \vee \beta)|\}$.

Clearly, the equalities (dsp) allow for consistently extending $\mathfrak{s}$ to all sets of pairs of ordinals, obtaining in particular that $\mathfrak{s}(E \times F) = \mathfrak{s}(E) \cdot \mathfrak{s}(F)$.

Then we have

Theorem 4.5. *Let $(\mathbb{U}, \mathfrak{s})$ be a multiplicative Aristotelian numerosity.*

Let ψ map each set $E \in \mathbb{U}$ to the counting function $\psi_E \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{N})$ such that $\psi_E(\alpha) = |E_\alpha|$, where $E_\alpha = E \cap \{\beta \in \Omega \mid \beta \sqsubseteq \alpha\}$.

Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be the kernel of the homomorphism $J : \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{E}$ of Thm. 2.7, and let $\mathfrak{i} = \mathfrak{I} \cap \mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{Z})$ be the restriction of $\mathfrak{I}$ to $\mathscr{B}(\Omega, \mathbb{Z})$.

Then $\mathfrak{i}$ is generated by the differences $\psi_E - \psi_F$ with $\mathfrak{s}(E) = \mathfrak{s}(F)$, and there is a unique ordered ring isomorphism $\sigma : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathbb{Z}^* \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ that makes the following diagram commute[17]

[16] Notice that we use here the natural product of ordinals, which agrees with the product of the field $\mathbb{E}$, in order to avoid *absorption phaenomena*.

[17] here $\imath$ is the inclusion map, and $\pi_{\mathfrak{i}}$ and $\pi_{\mathfrak{I}}$ are the projections onto the quotients modulo the ideals $\mathfrak{i}$ and $\mathfrak{I}$, respectively,



In particular $\mathfrak{n} = \sigma \circ \mathfrak{s}$ *is the Euclidean numerosity function, and the Euclidean field* $\mathbb{E}$ *is uniquely determined by* $\mathfrak{s}$*.*

Proof.

Let E be a set of ordinals: then $\sum_k \chi_E(k)$ is the Euclidean numerosity of E, by definition, and the corresponding counting function is precisely ψ_E. On the other hand, the transfinite sum of nonnegative integers has been defined above in a consistent way also inside the ring $\mathfrak{A}$, so $\mathfrak{s}(E) = \sum_k \chi_E(k)$.

We have already remarked that the axiom CA holds in $\mathfrak{A}$ for transfinite sums of integers. Moreover the equality (dsp) yields that also both axioms DA1 and DA2 hold. It follows that $\mathfrak{s}(E) = \mathfrak{s}(F)$ if and only if $\psi_E \equiv \psi_F \mod \mathfrak{i}$, and σ is uniquely and consistently defined by $\sigma(\mathfrak{s}(E) - \mathfrak{s}(F)) = [(\psi_E - \psi_F) \mod \mathfrak{i}]$.

□

Remark 4.6. The last point of the above theorem shows that the Euclidean field $\mathbb{E}$ arises quite naturally from a numerosity theory that satisfies very reasonable assumptions which extend and interpret the Euclidean common notions.

5 The existence of the field of the Euclidean numbers

In this section we ground on a particular kind of ordinals, that we call *complete ordinals*: they will be used as convenient "check points" for the values of the transfinite sums, and of the corresponding counting functions, in order to produce a model of the field of the Euclidean numbers.

5.1 The complete ordinals

Considering the polynomial representation given in Subsection 1.2, we call an ordinal *complete* when it is the sum of *all monomials in a given set of*

δs, with *degrees bounded by the same integer* and *equal factorial coefficients*. More precisely, we give the following definition:

Definition 5.1. An ordinal α is *complete* if there is a finite set $\Delta = \{\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_n}\}$ of δ-numbers (called the *basis* of α) and an integer m (the *degree* of α) such that

$$\alpha = m! \sum_{e_i \leq m} \delta_{j_1}^{e_1} \dots \delta_{j_n}^{e_m} = m! \, [\Delta^m]_\sigma,$$

where Δ^m denotes the product $\delta_{j_1}^m \cdot \dots \cdot \delta_{j_n}^m$, and $[\Delta^m]_\sigma = \sum_{\omega^h | \Delta^m} \omega^h$ is the sum of all divisors of Δ^m.

The restriction of the lattice operations $\vee, \wedge$ of Ω to the set $\mathfrak{Q}$ of the complete ordinals induces a lattice structure according to the following definitions

$$(m! \, [\Delta^m]_\sigma) \sqcup (n! \, [\Gamma^n]_\sigma) = \max\,(m,n)! \left[(\Delta \cup \Gamma)^{\max\,(m,n)}\right]_\sigma$$

$$(m! \, [\Delta^m]_\sigma) \sqcap (n! \, [\Gamma^n]_\sigma) = \min\,(m,n)! \left[(\Delta \cap \Gamma)^{\min\,(m,n)}\right]_\sigma$$

Given any ordinal $\alpha = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \omega^{j_n}$ denote by

$$Q[\alpha] = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{Q} \mid \xi \sqsupseteq \alpha\}$$

the set of the complete ordinals formal-including a. Then

Lemma 5.2. *Given an ordinal $\alpha = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \omega^{j_n}$, and a complete $\xi = s! \, [\Delta^s]_\sigma$, one has $\alpha \sqsubseteq \xi$ if and only if $a_n \omega^{j_n} \sqsubseteq \xi$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$, hence*

$$\xi \in Q[\alpha] \iff s \geq max(a_1, ..., a_N) \text{ and } \operatorname{lcm}(\omega^{j_1}, ..., \omega^{j_N}) \mid \Delta^s.$$

More generally, given ordinals $\alpha_l = \sum_{n=1}^{N_l} a_{ln} \omega^{j_{ln}}$ for $1 \leq l \leq L$, one has

$$\bigcap_{l=1}^{L} Q[\alpha_l] = Q[m\omega^h],$$

where

$$m = \max\{a_{ln} \mid l \leq L,\, n \leq N_l\} \text{ and } \omega^h = \operatorname{lcm}(\omega^{j_{ln}})_{l \leq L,\, n \leq N_l}.$$

Hence the family of all $Q[\alpha]$s has the finite intersection property*, actually it is* stable under finite intersection*, and so it generates a nontrivial filter $\mathcal{Q}$ on $\mathfrak{Q}$.*

Proof. Let $\xi = s!\,[\Delta^s]_\sigma$ be in $Q[\alpha_l]$; then clearly $s \geq \max\,(a_{l1}, ..., a_{lN_l})$ and $\omega^{j_{ln}} \mid \Delta^s$ for $1 \leq n \leq N_l$, so $\omega^h \mid \Delta^s$, and all statements hold.

□

We summarize in the following proposition those properties of the $Q(\alpha)$s in connection with the formal inclusion that will be important in dealing with the field of Euclidean numbers

Proposition 5.3. *The family of the sets $Q[\alpha]$ fulfills the following properties for all $j \in \Omega$ and all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$:*

1. *if $\beta \in \mathfrak{Q}$, then* $\forall h \in \Omega\, \forall k < \omega^j\, (\,\omega^j \odot h + k \sqsubseteq \beta \iff \omega^j \odot h, h, k \sqsubseteq \beta\,)$;
2. *if $\beta \in Q[\delta_j^{n+m}]$, then* $\forall k < \delta_j^{m+1}\, (\,\delta_j^n k \sqsubseteq \beta \iff k \sqsubseteq \beta\,)$;
3. *if $\beta \in Q[\delta_j^{2n-1}]$, then* $\forall h, k < \delta_j^n\, (\,\delta_j^n h + k \sqsubseteq \beta \iff h, k \sqsubseteq \beta\,)$;
4. *for all $\alpha < \delta_j^n$ there exists $\xi \in Q[\alpha]$, $\xi < \delta_j^n$.*

Proof.

Point 1 holds because any summand in $\omega^j \odot h$ is a multiple of the corresponding summand of h, and the coefficients of h and k do not sum up, being any summand in $\omega^j \odot h$ larger than anyone in k.[18]

Point 2: By Lemma 5.2, if $k = \sum_{l=0}^m \delta_j^l k_l < \delta_j^{m+1}$ and $k_l = \sum_i a_{il}\omega^{r_{il}} < \delta_j$, then

$$\delta_j^n k \sqsubseteq \beta \iff \delta_j^{n+l} k_l \sqsubseteq\ \beta \text{ for } 0 \leq l \leq m \iff a_{il}\delta_j^{n+l}\omega^{r_{il}} \sqsubseteq \beta \text{ for all } i, l$$

Any $\beta \in Q[\delta_j^{n+m}]$ has the form $\beta = s!\,[\Delta^s]_\sigma$, with $\delta_j \in \Delta$ and $s \geq (n+m)$, so

$$a_{il}\delta_j^{n+l}\omega^{r_{il}} \sqsubseteq s!\,[\Delta^s]_\sigma \text{ for all } i, l \iff \max{}_{i,l}(a_{il}) \leq s \text{ and } \operatorname{lcm}(\omega^{r_{il}})_{i,l} \,|\, \Delta^s$$

Hence

$$\delta_j^n k \sqsubseteq\ \beta = s!\,[\Delta^s]_\sigma \iff k \sqsubseteq \beta = s!\,[\Delta^s]_\sigma.$$

Point 3: If $h, k < \delta_j^n$, then $\delta_j^n h + k = \delta_j^n h \vee k$. Hence the implication

$$\beta \in Q[\delta_j^{2n-1}] \implies \forall h, k < \delta_j^n\, (\delta_j^n h \vee k\ \sqsubseteq \beta \Longleftrightarrow h, k \sqsubseteq \beta)$$

[18] Remark that, in general, $\omega^j \odot h \sqsubseteq \beta \in \mathfrak{Q}$ *does not imply* $\omega^j \sqsubseteq \beta$, due to the well known *absorbtion phenomena* of usual ordinal multiplication: *e.g.* $\delta_1 \odot \delta_2 = \delta_2 \sqsubseteq \delta_2$, but $\delta_1 \not\sqsubseteq \delta_2$.

is given by taking $m+1=n$ in Point 3.

Point 4 holds because the least common multiple of ordinals less than δ_j^n is itself less than δ_j^n.

□

5.2 The Euclidean ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}(\Omega)$

Let $\mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$ be an ultrafilter on the set Ω_{ω^j} of the ordinals less than ω^j. Given an Ω-sequence $\langle Q_k \mid k \in \Omega\rangle$ of qualified subsets $Q_k \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$, put

$$U_j\left(\langle Q_k\rangle\right) = \bigcup_{k\in\Omega} \left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k\right)$$

Lemma 5.4. *The family $U_j\left(\langle Q_k\rangle\right)$ has the finite intersection property; more precisely, it is closed under binary intersections*

$$U_j\left(\langle Q_k\rangle\right) \cap U_j\left(\langle R_l\rangle\right) = U_j\left(\langle Q_k \cap R_k\rangle\right).$$

Moreover, for $r > j$

$$U_j\left(\langle Q_k\rangle\right) \cap U_j\left(\langle R_l\rangle\right) \cap \Omega_{\omega^r} \supseteq \bigcup_{k\in\omega} \left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k \cap R_k\right) \neq \emptyset \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. In fact

$$\begin{aligned} U_j\left(\langle Q_k\rangle\right) \cap U_j\left(\langle R_l\rangle\right) &= \bigcup_{k,l\in\Omega} \left[\left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k\right) \cap \left(\omega^j \odot l + R_l\right)\right] \\ &= \bigcup_{k\in\Omega} \left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k \cap R_k\right) \end{aligned}$$

because $\left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k\right) \cap \left(\omega^j \odot l + R_l\right) = \emptyset$ whenever $k \neq l$. So (5.1) follows immediately

□

Theorem 5.1. *There exist free ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$ on Ω_{ω^j}, for all $j < \Omega$, and $\mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ on Ω such that*

1. *for any Ω-sequence $\langle Q_k \mid k \in \Omega\rangle$ of qualified subsets $Q_k \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$*

$$U_j\left(\langle Q_k\rangle\right) = \bigcup_{k\in\Omega} \left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k\right) \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)$$

and

$$\forall r > j\,.\; U_j\left(\langle Q_k\rangle\right) \cap\, \Omega_{\omega^r} \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^r)$$

2. Recall that $Q\,[\beta] = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{Q} \mid \xi \sqsupseteq \beta\}$. *Then*

$$\forall \beta \in \Omega\,.\; Q\,[\beta] \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega) \quad \textit{and} \quad \forall \beta < \delta^n_t \leq \omega^j.\; Q\,[\beta] \cap \Omega_{\omega^j} \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on j.

For $j = 1$ let $\mathcal{U}(\omega)$ be a (possibly selective) ultrafilter on $\omega = \mathbb{N}$, containing the set $\{n! \mid n \in \omega\}$.

Now let the $\mathcal{U}(\omega^s)$s be conveniently defined for $s \leq j$, and consider the families

$$\bigcup_{k<\omega} \left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k\right),\; Q_k \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^j) \;\text{ and }\; Q\,[\beta] \cap \Omega_{\omega^{j+1}},\; \beta < \delta^n_t \leq \omega^{j+1}.$$

Each of them enjoys separately the finite intersection property, actually both of them are closed under finite intersections: the former by Lemma 5.4, and the latter by Lemma 5.2. (Remark that $\delta^n_t \leq \omega^{j+1}$ if and only if $\delta^n_t \leq \omega^j$.)

So we have only to prove that for all $Q_k \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$ and all $\beta < \delta^n_t \leq \omega^j$ there exists $k < \omega$ such that

$$\left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k\right) \;\cap\; Q\,[\beta] \cap \Omega_{\omega^{j+1}} \neq \emptyset$$

Since $\beta < \omega^j$, one has $Q_k \cap Q[\beta] \neq \emptyset$, by induction hypothesis, and $k = 0$ works. So we can take $\mathcal{U}(\omega^{j+1})$ to be any ultrafilter containing both families of sets.

For limit j, assume that $\mathcal{U}(\omega^s)$ has been conveniently defined for all $s < j$. Then, by induction hypothesis, the family

$$\bigcup_{k\in\Omega} (\omega^s \odot k + Q_k) \cap Q[\beta] \cap \Omega_{\omega^r},\; Q_k \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^s),\; \beta < \delta^n_t \leq \omega^r,\; \text{and}\;\; s < r < j$$

belongs to $\mathcal{U}(\omega^r)$, hence it has the finite intersection property.

If $\omega^j > \delta^n_t$, then any ultrafilter containing this family can be taken to be $\mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$, because $\delta^n_t \leq \omega^r$ for some $r < j$.

If $\omega^j = \delta^n_t$, then Point 4 of Proposition 5.3 provides the existence of elements less than ω^j in $\bigcup_{k\in\Omega} (\omega^s \odot k + Q_k) \cap Q[\beta]$.

Finally, after having $\mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$ defined for all $j \in \Omega$, define $\mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ as an ultrafilter on Ω containing both families

$$\bigcup_{k\in\Omega} \left(\omega^j \odot k + Q_k\right),\; Q_k \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^j),\; j \in \Omega, \;\text{ and }\; \{Q\,[\beta] \mid \beta \in \Omega\}.$$

The finite intersection property may be proved by the same argument of the case of limit j, and all conditions are fulfilled.

□

We name *Euclidean* an ultrafilter satisfying the conditions of $\mathcal{U}(\Omega)$, since any such ultrafilter provides a model of the field of the Euclidean numbers, as we shall see in the next subsection.

Remark that any Euclidean ultrafilter is concentrated on the set $\mathfrak{Q}$ of the complete ordinals.

5.3 A construction of the field of the Euclidean numbers

We may now present a construction of a field enjoying the properties of the Euclidean numbers axiomatized in Section 2.

Let $\mathbb{R}^\Omega$ be the algebra of all real valued functions on Ω, and recall that

$$\mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R}) = \{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega \mid \exists j \in \Omega\, \forall \beta \in \Omega\, .\, \varphi(\beta) = \varphi(\langle \beta \rangle_j)\}$$

is the subalgebra of the "periodic" functions. Then, by Theorem 2.6, every element of $\mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R})$ is the counting function of some sequence $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R})$, and conversely.

• Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a Euclidean ultrafilter on Ω, and let $\mathfrak{I}$ be the corresponding maximal ideal of $\mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R})$

$$\mathfrak{I} := \{\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R}) \,|\, \exists Q \in \mathcal{U}\, \forall \beta \in Q\, .\, \varphi(\beta) = 0\}$$

• let

$$J \,:\, \mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R})/\mathfrak{I} = \mathbb{E}$$

be the canonical homomorphism onto the corresponding quotient field, which becomes an ordered field with the ordering induced by the natural partial ordering of $\mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R})$.

• Denote by $[\varphi]$ the coset $J(\varphi) = \varphi + \mathfrak{I} \in \mathbb{E}$ of the function $\varphi \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R})$.

• Given any Ω-sequence $x \in \mathscr{S}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R})$ define the sum $\sum_k x_k = \Sigma(x)$ as the coset $[\varphi_x] = J(\varphi_x)$ of the corresponding counting function $\varphi_x \in \mathscr{B}(\Omega,\, \mathbb{R})$.

Then we have

Theorem 5.2. *The ordered field* $\mathbb{E}$ *satisfies the axiom* RA*, and the transfinite sum* $\Sigma : \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{E}$ *satisfies the axiom* CA*; moreover* Σ *can be uniquely extended to an* $\mathbb{E}$*-linear map* $\Sigma : \mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E}) \to \mathbb{E}$ *so as to satisfy both axioms* DA1-DA2*. Hence* $\mathbb{E}$ *becomes a Euclidean field.*

Proof.

- The axiom RA holds by definition.
- The map $x \mapsto \varphi_x$ is $\mathbb{R}$-linear, so Σ is $\mathbb{R}$-linear.
- The axiom CA holds because the ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ contains all cones $C[\beta] \supseteq Q[\beta]$.
- Now we extend the map Σ to $\mathscr{S}(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ according to the axiom DA2. Let $\xi_h = \sum_k x_{hk}$ be given, and assume that $x_{hk} = 0$ for $h, k \geq \omega^j$.

  Put

$$\Sigma(\xi) = \sum_h \xi_h = \sum_i y_i \quad where \quad y_i = \begin{cases} x_{hk} & if \quad i = \omega^j \odot h + k \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

  The definition is well posed.
  Namely, let $\xi_h = \sum_k x'_{hk}$ be other expressions of the same elements $\xi_h \in \mathbb{E}$: assume w.l.o.g. that also $x'_{hk} = 0$ for $h, k \geq \omega^j$, and define y'_i accordingly. Then, for each $h < \omega^j$ there exists a qualified set $Q_h \in \mathcal{U}(\omega^j)$ such that $\sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_{hk} = \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x'_{hk}$ for all $\alpha \in Q_h$.

  The Euclidean ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ contains the sets

$$U_j\left(\langle Q_h \rangle\right) = \bigcup_{h \in \Omega} \left(\omega^j \odot h + Q_h\right),$$

  hence, for all $\alpha \in U_{\mathrm{j}}\left(\langle Q_h \rangle\right) \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\sum_{i \sqsubseteq \alpha} y_i = \sum_{\omega^j \odot h + k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_{hk} = \sum_{\omega^j \odot h + k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x'_{hk} = \sum_{i \sqsubseteq \alpha} y'_i,$$

  and so $\sum_i y_i = \sum_i y'_i$.
  Moreover one has, for all $\alpha \in Q[\omega^j] \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\sum_{i \sqsubseteq \alpha} y_i = \sum_{\omega^j \odot h + k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_{hk} = \sum_{h,k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_{hk} = \sum_{i \sqsubseteq \alpha} \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_{hk}.$$

It follows that

$$\sum_h \sum_k x_{hk} = \sum_i \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_{hk},$$

and also the axiom DA1 holds.

- The extended map Σ is $\mathbb{E}$-linear.
  In fact, the map J is an $\mathbb{R}$-algebra homomorphism, so

$$(\varphi_x \varphi_y)(\alpha) = \varphi_x(\alpha)\varphi_y(\alpha) = \sum_{h \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_h \sum_{k \sqsubseteq \alpha} y_k = \sum_{h \vee k \sqsubseteq \alpha} x_h y_k$$

  Hence $[\varphi_x][\varphi_y] = (\sum_h x_h)(\sum_k y_k) = \sum_i w_i$, where $w_i = \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_h y_k$.
  Then, for $\zeta = \sum_l z_l$, one has

$$\zeta \cdot \sum_h \xi_h = (\sum_l z_l)(\sum_i \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_{hk}) = \sum_s \sum_{s = l \vee i} (z_l \sum_{h \vee k = i} x_{hk}) = \sum_s \sum_{s = l \vee h \vee k} z_l x_{hk}$$

$$\sum_h \zeta \xi_h = \sum_h \sum_i \sum_{l \vee k = i} z_l x_{hk} = \sum_s \sum_{s = h \vee i} \sum_{l \vee k = i} z_l x_{hk} = \sum_s \sum_{s = l \vee h \vee k} z_l x_{hk}$$

□

So the existence of the Euclidean field $\mathbb{E}$ is implied by that of Euclidean ultrafilters.

Appendix: *The Euclidean continuum*

In ancient geometry, *lines* and *segments* are not considered as *sets of points*; on the contrary, in the last two centuries, the reductionistic attitude of modern mathematics has tried and described the Euclidean geometry through a *set theoretic interpretation*. So the *Euclidean continuum* has been identified with the *Dedekind continuum* and the Euclidean line has been identified with (or at least considered *isomorphic* to) the *set of real numbers* (once an origin O and a unit segment OA have been fixed). Although this identification be almost universally accepted today, nevertheless it contradicts various theorems of the Euclidean geometry.

As an important example, we cite the Euclidean statement that a segment AB can be *divided in two congruent segments* AM and MB. If AB is identified with the Dedekind continuum then, either AM has a maximum or MB has a minumum. Thus AM and MB are not congruent, hence *stricto*

sensu the Dedekind continuum is not a correct model for the Euclidean continuum. In order to construct a consistent model, we are forced to assume that the *points* A, B and M *do not belong* to the segment AB. So the picture which comes out of the *Euclidean straight line* is a *linearly ordered* set $\mathfrak{E}$, where the Euclidean segment AB is a *subset* of $\mathfrak{E}$ which *cannot* be identified with the set theoretical segment

$$S(A,B) := \{X \in \mathfrak{E} \mid A < X < B\}\,, \text{ because } M \in S(A,B) \setminus AB.$$

So we might better think of the segment AB as a set of *atoms* with lots of *empty spaces* between them.

In the Euclidean theory of proportions, a *set* of magnitudes can be put in biunique correspondence with the *lengths* of the segments, and the lengths of segments satisfy the *axiom of Archimedes*. Hence, assuming also this axiom in the set theoretic interpretation of (oriented) segments, they build a field isomorphic to the real field, so that, after a suitable identification,

$$\mathbb{R} \subset \mathfrak{E} \tag{5.2}$$

and, since $AB \subsetneq S(A,B) \setminus \mathbb{R}$, we can assume that $AB = S(A,B) \setminus \mathbb{R}$.

Now take an atom $\mathtt{s}$ in AB: the *distance* between A and $\mathtt{s}$ cannot be *measured* by a *length*, because $S(A,\mathtt{s})$ is not a segment and no segment is congruent to $S(A,\mathtt{s})$. So the *lengths* cannot be as many as the *distances*; if the lengths are in biunique correspondence with $\mathbb{R}$, the distances can be put in biunique correspondence with the full $\mathfrak{E}$. Assuming that also the distances form a field, the inclusion (5.2) implies that $\mathfrak{E}$ is a *non-Archimedean* field. So the Euclidean continuum leads to the non-Archimedean geometry as described by Veronese at the end of the XIX century (see [24, 25])[19] However there are may non-Archimedean fields which contain the real numbers. Moreover, every non-Archimedean field has gaps. Thus the question arises as to wether a non-Archimedean field provides a more satisfactory model of the Euclidean continuum than the Dedekind continuum.

In a naive way, a *continuum* is a linearly ordered set without *holes*. In contrast with our intuition, a set X which satisfies the following property

$$\forall a, b \in X,\ a < b,\ \exists c \in X,\ a < c < b \tag{5.3}$$

[19] Actually Veronese considered also infinitesimal segments, but this is matter of definitions that will be not discussed here.

is not a continuum since there are *holes* (think *e.g.* to a segment of rational numbers: here the irrational numbers can be considered holes). However also the Dedekind continuum is not satsfactory: the arguments outlined above yield that the lenghts form a Dedekind continuum, but there are distances which are not lenghts. Thus in a sense also the Dedekind continuum contains holes, represented by the distances which are not lenghts. So we are tempted to give the following definition which generalizes (5.3):

> *a linearly ordered "set" X is an continuum if given two subsets A and B such that $\forall a \in A,\ \forall b \in B,\ a < b$, then*
>
> $$\exists c \in X,\ a < c < b \tag{5.4}$$

Assuming this definition, a continuum is a *proper class* in the sense of Von Neumann-Bernays-Gdel (NBG) class theory. This is the point of view of Ehrlich [17], where the *class of surreal numbers* is viewed as the *absolute arithmetic continuum*. In fact, as far as the order structure is concerned, the surreal numbers have the order type described by (5.4).

We prefer to have the continuum to be a *set*; so we assume the existence of an inaccessible ordinal and we give the following definition:

Definition 5.5. *A linearly ordered set X is a Euclidean continuum if it is Ω-saturated, i.e. given any two subsets A and B such that $|A|, |B| < |X| = |\Omega|$ and $\forall a \in A,\ \forall b \in B,\ a < b$, we have that*

$$\exists c \in X,\ a < c < b \tag{5.5}$$

Grounding on this discussion, we are led to assume that the Euclidean line $\mathfrak{E}$ is an *Euclidean continuum* equipped with the structure of *real closed* field, so it is *isomorphic* to the field of Euclidean numbers $\mathbb{E}$.

The fact that $\mathfrak{E}$ has to be real closed is a reasonable request: it has to contain not only all Euclidean numbers *stricto sensu*,[20] but also all zeroes of sign-changing polynomials.

At this point it seems appropriate to explain why, in our opinion, the order type of $\mathfrak{E}$ must be η_Ω rather that η_α[21] for some $\alpha < \Omega$.

[20] *I.e.* those constructible by *ruler and compass*.

[21] η_α is the order type of an α-saturated ordered set of size α; assuming the generalized continuum hypotesis, such sets exist for every regular α.

We sketch two arguments. The first is *set theoretical*. The condition (5.4) seems implicit in the notion of (absolute) continuum, but working with proper classes meets several technical limitations, which do not arise in workig with inaccessible ordinals; so it seems appropriate to "truncate" the universe at the first inaccessible level. In doing this, the Euclidean continuum becomes indiscernible from the absolute continuum of Ehlrich, because then the class of surreal numbers would be a field isomorphic to $\mathbb{E}$.

Moreover, taking into account the role of the Euclidean numbers as *numerosities*, the use of a saturated real closed field $\mathbb{F}$ of accessible cardinality seems inappropriate: it contradicts the natural assumption that a *powerset*, or a set of f*unctions*, has a numerosity in $\mathbb{F}$ whenever the original *set* (the *domain*) has a numerosity in $\mathbb{F}$.

The second argument is *"geometric"*. The assumption $|\mathfrak{E}| = \Omega$ yields $\mathfrak{E} \cong \mathbb{E}$, and hence it inherits a very rich structure. In particular, every Euclidean number being a transfinite sum of reals, one has that any *distance* is a transfinite (algebraic) sum of *lengths*. For instance

$$\sum_{k\in[0,\omega)} \frac{1}{2^k} = 2 - \frac{1}{2^{\omega-1}} \tag{5.6}$$

(see equation (3.6) in subsection 3.6) so adding infinitely many segments of lenght 2^{-k} cannot provide a segment of length 2, but only a quantity (a *distance*) which is (infinitesimally) smaller than 2. In the Euclidean world, Achilles will never properly reach the turtle, remaining forever at infinitesimal distance. Assuming that in the physical world infinitesimal quantities cannot be measured and so do not count, the turtle is reached. In our opinion, this joke might enphasize the fact that non-Archimedean fields (and, in the future, hopefully also the Euclidean field) might be very useful in building models of natural phenomena (see some examples in [1, 3, 10, 12, 11]).

References

[1] Albeverio S., Fenstad J.E., Hoegh-Krohn R., Lindstrom T. - *Nonstandard Methods in Stochastic Analysis and Mathematical Physics*, Dover Books on Mathematics, 2006.

[2] V. Benci - *I numeri e gli insiemi etichettati,* in Conferenze del seminario di matematica dell' Università di Bari, vol. 261, Laterza, Bari 1995, p. 29.

[3] V. Benci - Ultrafunctions and generalized solutions, *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* **13** (2013), 461–486, arXiv:1206.2257.

[4] V. Benci, M. Di Nasso - Numerosities of labelled sets: a new way of counting, *Adv. Math.* **21** (2003), 505–67.

[5] V. Benci, M. Di Nasso - A purely algebraic characterization of the hyperreal numbers, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*

[6] V. Benci, M. Di Nasso, M. Forti - An Aristotelian notion of size, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **143** (2006), 43–53.

[7] V. Benci, M. Di Nasso, M. Forti - An Euclidean notion of size for mathematical universes, *Logique et Analyse* **50** (2007), 43–62 .

[8] V. Benci, M. Di Nasso, M. Forti - The eightfold path to nonstandard analysis, in *Nonstandard Methods and Applications in Mathematics* (N. J. Cutland, M. Di Nasso, and D. A. Ross, eds.), Lecture Notes in Logic **25**, Association for Symbolic Logic, AK Peters, Wellesley, MA, 2006, 3–44.

[9] V. Benci, P. Freguglia - Alcune osservazioni sulla matematica non archimedea, *Matem. Cultura e Soc., RUMI*, **1** (2016), 105–122.

[10] V. Benci, L. Horsten, S. Wenmackers - Non-Archimedean probability, *Milan j. Math.* **81** (2013), , 121–151. arXiv:1106.1524.

[11] V. Benci, L. Horsten, S. Wenmackers - Infinitesimal Probabilities, *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* (2016), to appear.

[12] V. Benci, L. Luperi Baglini - A model problem for ultrafunctions, in: *Variational and Topological Methods: Theory, Applications, Numerical Simulations, and Open Problems*, *Electron. J. Diff. Eqns.*, Conference 21 (2014), 11–21.

[13] A. Blass, M. Di Nasso, M. Forti - Quasi-selective ultrafilters and asymptotic numerosities, *Adv. Math.* **231** (2012), 1462–1486.

[14] C.C. Chang, H.J. Keisler - *Model Theory*, Dover Books on Mathematics.

[15] J.H. Conway - *On numbers and games*, 2^{nd} ed., A. K. Peters, Natick 2001.

[16] M. Di Nasso, M. Forti - Numerosities of point sets over the real line, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **362** (2010), 5355–5371.

[17] Ph. Ehrlich - The absolute arithmetic continuum and the unification of all numbers great and small,*Bull. Symb. Logic* **18** (2012), .

[18] Euclid - *The Elements* (T.L. Heath, translator), 2nd edition (reprint), Dover, New York 1956.

[19] M. Forti, G. Morana Roccasalvo - Natural numerosities of sets of tuples, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **367** (2015), 275–292

[20] H.J. Keisler - *Foundations of Infinitesimal Calculus*, Prindle, Weber & Schmidt, Boston 1976.

[21] Levi-Civita T. - Sugli infiniti ed infinitesimi attuali quali elementi analitici, *Atti R. Istit. Veneto Sci. Lett. Arti, Venezia* (Serie **7**) (1892–93), 1765–1815.

[22] P. Mancosu - Measuring the size of infinite collections of natural numbers: was Cantor's theory of infinite number inevitable?, *Rev. Symb. Logic* **4** (2009), 612–646.

[23] A. Robinson - Non-standard Analysis, *Proc. Royal Acad. Sci., Amsterdam* (Series A) **64** (1961), 432–440.

[24] G. Veronese - Il continuo rettilineo e l'assioma V di Archimede, *Mem. Reale Accad. Lincei, Classe Sci. Nat. Fis. Mat.* **4** (1889), 603–624.

[25] G. Veronese - Intorno ad alcune osservazioni sui segmenti infiniti o infinitesimi attuali, *Math. Annalen* **47** (1896), 423–432.